



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 13, 2010

No. 72

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
May 13, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SHEILA JACKSON LEE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Congress opens another day of work with a moment of prayer, Lord. In doing so, it sets an example for the people of this Nation whose government is of the people.

Only in and through reflection and prayer will Your people grow in virtue. To retain its strength and moral integrity, this Republic needs reflective and virtuous people. So we pray.

We pray not only for ourselves, but for all those whose lives are touched by our own. We pray for all those whose lives will be affected by our decisions and our actions in the work set before us.

Be with us now, Lord God Almighty, for we acknowledge You in the beginning and seek You and that Your will be done in the end. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HEINRICH led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### THE DISCLOSE ACT

(Mr. HEINRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam Speaker, like most Americans I am outraged by the Supreme Court's decision in the Citizens United case that overturned decades of law that prohibited corporations from spending unlimited money in political campaigns. The Citizens United decision was a victory for the Wall Street banks, credit card companies and Big Oil, but it was a slap in the face to average Americans.

Today, I am proud to announce that I am cosponsoring the Disclose Act, which is a direct response to the Citizens United decision. The Disclose Act will increase transparency and disclosure of political spending. It will prevent foreign corporations from places like Venezuela and Saudi Arabia from influencing American elections, and it will ensure that corporations that took money in the Bush bailout can't spend that money to influence our elections.

It is time we put the American voter first and stop corporate excess in our elections. The Disclose Act will do just that.

### CLEAN AND SAFE ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, when it comes to exploring for Earth's natural resources, there can be no compromise on safety. The recent catastrophe in the Gulf of Mexico reminds us that the safety of our workers and the environment cannot be taken for granted.

There are 3,500 oil rigs in the Gulf of Mexico. Accidents are extremely rare, and our goal needs to be zero tolerance. We are better off having high standards and drilling for our own oil than crossing our fingers and hoping that other countries will adhere to our standards.

We have to pursue safe drilling, and use our own resources to clean our air, land, and water. The U.S. can reap between \$2.2 trillion and \$3.7 trillion in revenues and use our own offshore oil and gas to fund cleaning up our Nation's waterways, build energy efficient transportation systems, and invest in clean coal, nuclear, wind, solar, geothermal, and other renewable energy sources.

H.R. 2227 does just that. We create millions of jobs, don't borrow money from China, stop sending billions to OPEC, and don't raise taxes. So instead of running up record deficits, instead of having millions without jobs, let's get Americans back to work and pass H.R. 2227, the American Conservation and Clean Energy Independence Act. America can't keep waiting.

### ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3443

honor Asian Pacific American Heritage Month.

As the Representative of the 47th Congressional District of California, I have a very diverse community, and a lot of them fall into the Asian and Pacific Islander American community. As a proud cosponsor of House Resolution 435, which celebrates Asian Pacific American Heritage Month, I would like to first thank the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus for recognizing the important contributions made by their community to our Nation.

For the past 14 years, I have witnessed firsthand the rich culture and contributions that the Asian Pacific Islander community brings to my district in Orange County. The community is an integral component of Orange County, and we see leadership all over the place in Orange County from that community increasingly, as leaders in academia and the arts and government and the military and in the private sector.

I would like to recognize all of the community partners and their outstanding service in the Asian Pacific Islander American community of Orange County and their continued efforts.

#### HARVARD STUDY

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, the Federal Government is deep in debt and digging fast. We all know the importance of balancing the Federal budget, but we disagree on how to do that. How can we reduce the deficit without hurting our economy? Do we cut spending, or do we raise taxes?

I have here an analysis from two Harvard professors looking at how large changes in fiscal policy affect deficits and economies. Their research shows that "fiscal adjustments based upon spending cuts and no tax increases are more likely to reduce deficit and debt over GDP ratios than those based on tax increases."

The authors looked at decades of economic data around the world and came to the conclusion that it is best to go about reducing large deficits through government restraint and spending cuts.

Some think that we can keep spending recklessly, raise taxes, and balance the books. This study shows that we must get our spending under control. Raising taxes only kills jobs in our economy, leaving the government in an even worse fiscal situation.

This study is available on my Web site. I encourage all to examine it.

#### RECOGNIZING FRANK HERHOLD

(Mr. KLEIN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of the great leaders in my district in South Florida—Frank Herhold.

Frank is the executive director of the Marine Industries Association of South Florida, a position he has held since 1990. Even before taking on this leadership role, Frank operated a shipyard of his own, bringing his total career in the marine industry to over 30 years. After decades of hard work, Frank will be retiring this summer. I would personally like to thank him for his hard work and dedication to our community.

The marine industry is critical to South Florida's economy, and, under Frank's leadership, the Fort Lauderdale International Boat Show has become the world's largest, pumping millions of dollars into our local economy.

Frank is the consummate professional and friend, and it was a pleasure to work with him as we reformed Longshore insurance together and tackled other issues essential to the marine industry.

Frank, I wish you the best in your retirement, and thank you for your service to South Florida.

#### MORE COSTLY DISCLOSURES ABOUT GOVERNMENT HEALTH CARE TAKEOVER

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, more costly disclosures continue to come out about the government health care takeover. And why should we be surprised, when Speaker PELOSI told the American people that we need to—and I quote—"pass the bill so we can find out what is in it"?

The more we find out, the worse it looks. The latest analysis by the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office reveals that the health care takeover will cost at least \$115 billion more than originally estimated. This follows last month's CMS report that highlighted health care costs will increase by \$311 billion over the next 10 years, and will force millions of seniors off their current Medicare coverage.

Washington must stop promising one thing and delivering another, particularly when it comes to price tags. If Congress continues to drag its feet, runaway deficits and unsustainable debt are sure to cripple our economy and would lead us down the same path as Greece.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11th in the Global War on Terrorism. My sympathy to the family of Betty Jackson Mack of Gaston, South Carolina.

#### PASSING OF JERRY HILDEBRAND

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, over this past weekend our Nation lost one of the great champions of the unemployment insurance system.

Jerry Hildebrand was the Chief of Legislation for Unemployment Insurance at the Department of Labor, and he was intricately involved in every major UI reform over the past several decades.

Most recently, Jerry had been instrumental in ensuring the delivery of extended unemployment benefits and in helping States navigate reforms to their unemployment systems with the help of UI Modernization Grants. His advice about the possible impact of policy before enactment and his skillful work on implementation after the passage of legislation will be sorely missed.

He took his daughter to college this weekend, and then dropped dead. Our thoughts and prayers go out to Jerry's family, as well as to his colleagues at the Department of Labor. Jerry Hildebrand made our government work for the people, and that contribution will surely live on.

#### AMERICA COMPETES ACT

(Ms. SCHWARTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Today, the House of Representatives will take a significant step towards advancing American innovation and strengthening American competitiveness with the America COMPETES Act.

This bipartisan proposal will expand public-private collaboration, assist industry and manufacturers, improve science and mathematics education, and create new, good-paying jobs. It accomplishes this by continuing the Department of Energy's Advanced Research Projects, devoted to next-generation energy research and development projects; providing loan guarantees for small- and medium-sized manufacturers to enable them to access capital and become more efficient; and by promoting more research and development initiatives.

This bill is supported by more than 750 businesses and academic organizations, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, National Venture Capital Association, and the Biotech Industry Organization.

This continuing initiative is part of the Democratic solution to promote innovation and new technology in both older and new industries, prepare a skilled workforce, enhance our economic competitiveness, and build a strong 21st century national economy.

#### AMERICA COMPETES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HALVORSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 1344 and rule XVIII, the Chair

declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5116.

□ 1014

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5116) to invest in innovation through research and development, to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes, with Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, May 12, 2010, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 34 printed in part B of House Report 111-479 by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI) had been postponed.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MS. CHU

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 36 printed in part B of House Report 111-479.

Ms. CHU. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 36 offered by Ms. CHU:

Page 103, line 22, insert “, including from a 2-year to a 4-year institution” after “to another”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1344, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

□ 1015

Ms. CHU. Today, a woman sits in a classroom at East Los Angeles College, taking notes diligently as her professor explains the different types of inorganic chemical reactions. Sylvia is the first in her family to attend college. She can barely afford the low tuition rate, even though she works full time to help pay for books and put food on the table. She is the embodiment of the American Dream—studying, persevering, working, all with the hope of transferring to a 4-year college to earn her bachelor's degree in chemistry.

But the road ahead is tough. She struggles to find rigorous courses that meet the demands of the 4-year institutions. She doesn't have access to a chemistry lab and her community college cannot provide the research opportunities available to her fellow students at larger universities. But she represents our path to economic recovery. Her success is imperative to ensuring a skilled and diverse workforce for our Nation's future.

That's why I have introduced to the America COMPETES Act an amendment to include the community college and to help STEM students, particu-

larly women and underrepresented minorities, transition from a 2-year to a 4-year institution. It will ensure that all students, regardless of ethnicity or socioeconomic status, are afforded every opportunity to enter STEM fields. Without my amendment, we risk leaving Sylvia behind. We risk leaving her without the skills to earn a high-paying job that will provide her with the means to support her family and the skills to power our economic growth.

Forty-four percent of all STEM bachelor's degree holders attend community college at some point in their careers. Many of these students represent the neediest in our society. They are the ones who sacrifice so much just to better themselves and improve their chance of success. Nationally, community college students are older, more likely to receive financial aid, are more likely to be the first in their family to attend college, and are more likely to work while earning their degree. These students are the embodiment of the American Dream, and they must not be forgotten.

As a former professor at East Los Angeles College, I'm all too familiar with the hurdles these students face in working toward any bachelor's degree, much less those in the natural sciences or engineering. We need these students to succeed. By 2050, racial and ethnic minorities will make up over half of the college-age population. If we don't help them enter the most technologically competitive fields, we face a future in which America is no longer at the forefront of innovation.

I urge support of my amendment and the overall bill so that Sylvia and so many other students like her have the skills they need to be competitive and to ensure America will stay competitive tomorrow.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairwoman, I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment, although I do not intend to oppose it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL of Texas. We have no objection to the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished chairperson of the committee, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Let me just add that this is an excellent amendment that makes a good bill better; a good, bipartisan bill even better. And I thank the gentlelady for the content of this amendment.

Ms. CHU. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

The amendment was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MRS. HALVORSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 38 printed in part B of House Report 111-479.

Mrs. HALVORSON. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 38 offered by Mrs. HALVORSON:

Page 106, line 3, strike “CONSIDERATIONS.—In” and insert “CONSIDERATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In”.

Page 106, line 8, insert “and veterans” after “1885b”.

Page 106, after line 8, insert the following new paragraph:

(2) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “veteran” means a person who—

(A) served on active duty (other than active duty for training) in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period of more than 180 consecutive days, and who was discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable; or

(B) served on active duty (other than active duty for training) in the Armed Forces of the United States and was discharged or released from such service for a service-connected disability before serving 180 consecutive days.

For purposes of subparagraph (B), the term “service-connected” has the meaning given such term under section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1344, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. HALVORSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. HALVORSON. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Tennessee, Chairman GORDON, for his very hard work on this very important legislation that will spur innovation, modernize our manufacturing base, and prepare our workforce for the next generation of good-paying jobs.

I rise today in support of my amendment to the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act. My amendment is very simple. It will help expand career opportunities in science and engineering for veterans of our armed services. As the only Member from my State that serves on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am proud to stand up for the brave men and women who have served our country and our military. It is important for us to stand up for them not only when they are on Active Duty, but also when they return home.

Unfortunately, too many of our veterans have difficulty finding jobs when they transition back into civilian life. With the veterans' unemployment rate at about 13 percent, well above the national average, we need to do everything we can to provide veterans with career opportunities. The America COMPETES Reauthorization Act establishes a new postdoctoral research

fellowship program at the National Science Foundation. This program will award competitive, merit-based research fellowships for up to 3 years to graduates who have recently completed a doctoral degree in a field supported by the foundation. My amendment will instruct the director of the foundation to give consideration to the goal of promoting participation by veterans when evaluating applications.

Many of our Nation's veterans specialize in science and engineering fields during their service in the military, and some of them even had the opportunity to pursue advanced degrees in these fields during their service. Others choose to continue their education in science and engineering by pursuing doctorate degrees after they leave Active Duty. My amendment will help these uniquely qualified veterans build careers in science and engineering by encouraging them to compete for the new National Science Foundation postdoctoral research fellowships established by this bill. When our veterans ask for the opportunity to continue serving their country in the next generation of jobs, we should give them that chance, which is what my amendment seeks to do.

Once again, I thank Chairman GORDON and his staff for working with me on this amendment, and I ask for the support of my colleagues.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairwoman, I rise to claim time in opposition to this amendment, although I do not oppose it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL of Texas. In fact, I'm in strong support of the amendment, as it reemphasizes language that I had accepted at the full committee markup and is now included in title VII. In my opinion, we can't do enough to assist our veterans who are returning to school after putting their lives on the line so that all of us can enjoy the freedoms that we have in this country. Likewise, I remain committed to helping those institutions of higher education that are also going above and beyond the norm in helping our veterans receive their education.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HALVORSON. Madam Chair, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee, Chairman GORDON.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I thank the gentlelady and I commend my friend, the ranking member, Mr. HALL, for his continued commitment to veterans from World War II, like himself, and beyond. I also want to thank the gentlelady from Illinois for her good work on the Veterans Affairs' Committee and for this amendment promoting the inclusion of veterans in our STEM workforce.

Many of our veterans have technical backgrounds already. With some addi-

tional training, they are well positioned to continue serving their country through research discoveries that will benefit society and improve our economic competitiveness.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. HALVORSON. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. HALVORSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. HALVORSON. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. KRATOVIL

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that the amendments numbered 40 and 41 will not be offered at this time.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in part B of House Report 111-479.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 44 offered by Mr. KRATOVIL:

Page 149, after line 21, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 305. ENCOURAGING FEDERAL SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS TO PARTICIPATE IN STEM EDUCATION.**

Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in consultation with the Department of Education, shall develop a policy to—

(1) increase volunteerism in STEM education activities by encouraging scientists and engineers from Federal science agencies conducting nonmilitary scientific research and development, including scientists and engineers of the federally funded research and development centers supported by those agencies, to volunteer in STEM education activities, and by providing administrative support for such scientists and engineers to engage in such volunteerism; and

(2) support increased communication and partnerships between scientists and engineers from Federal science agencies conducting nonmilitary scientific research and development, including scientists and engineers of the federally funded research and development centers supported by those agencies, and elementary and secondary schools and teachers through volunteerism in STEM education activities.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1344, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. KRATOVIL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Kratovil-Connolly amendment to the America COMPETES Act, as well as in support of the underlying bill. I would first like to thank the chairman, Mr. GORDON, for allowing the amendment and also for the opportunity to speak on its behalf. And I also want to thank my colleague and friend, Mr. CONNOLLY, for his leadership on this issue as well.

Simply put, Madam Chair, our amendment seeks to inspire students to enter the exciting, fascinating, and often times lucrative fields of science and innovation, by presenting them with real life experiences of the men and women who are leaders in these fields. Our amendment would encourage Federal employees working in the fields of science and engineering to volunteer their time and expertise in STEM educational activity. By sharing their stories with students, we hope to encourage students to study and pursue similar careers while preparing them for the competitive 21st-century global economy and workforce.

Expanding and strengthening science and technology curricula will provide students with the tools they need to enter the workforce. Our amendment builds on this foundation by encouraging Federal scientists and engineers already working in these fields to volunteer their time and expertise to teach today's students how careers in these fields not only support American competitiveness but can contribute to their own professional growth.

The America COMPETES Act will strengthen America's role in an increasingly competitive world while our amendment will bolster this effort by encouraging scientists and engineers to share their real-world experiences with what we hope will be future scientists and engineers.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, as well as the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairwoman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not intend to oppose it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chair, I support this amendment and would hope if it is accepted, the chairman would continue to work with us to clarify the administrative language as we move to conference.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

□ 1030

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Chair, I thank my friend Mr. KRATOVIL from Maryland for his leadership, and I thank the chairman and the ranking

member of the committee for their leadership on this important topic of STEM education.

My 14 years in local government, helping to manage the 12th-largest school district in the United States and home to the number one high school in the United States 3 years in a row, a STEM high school, Thomas Jefferson, has taught me how important mathematics, science, engineering, and technology are for the future of our country, for competitiveness, American competitiveness. In a recent international assessment of 15-year-old students, the United States ranked 28th in math literacy and 24th in science literacy. We can and must do better, and this amendment, I think, will move us a long way toward that goal so that every community in America will have this opportunity, and our children will have a bright future in the sciences, in math, in technology, and in engineering.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Madam Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee, Chairman GORDON.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Let me inquire, how much time is left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 2¼ minutes. The gentleman from Texas has yielded back his time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. First let me say, Madam Chair, to my friend and ranking member, I am not sure what the technical corrections are that he is concerned about, but I assure you that we will certainly start working on that to clean up any language that needs to be cleaned up.

Additionally, I rise to support this good amendment. Scientists and engineers at the Federal science agencies have the experience and expertise to contribute greatly to STEM education. Whether it is through helping a teacher with a hands-on activity in the classroom, assisting with a local robotics competition, or serving as a mentor to a student, there are a variety of ways in which Federal scientists and engineers can volunteer their time to help improve STEM education. This amendment would increase volunteerism by scientists and engineers working in Federal agencies and would encourage the agencies to provide administrative support for those scientists and engineers to volunteer their time. I urge my colleagues to support this good bipartisan amendment.

Mr. KRATOVIL. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. KRATOVIL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 45 will not be offered at this time.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in part B of House Report 111-479.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 50 offered by Mr. FLAKE: Page 127, after line 13, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 256. SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

It is the sense of Congress that retaining graduate-level talent trained at American universities in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) fields is critical to enhancing the competitiveness of American businesses.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1344, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair. I believe this amendment is noncontroversial in nature. It merely adds sense of Congress language to the bill expressing that, "retaining graduate-level talent trained at American universities in STEM fields is critical to enhancing the competitiveness of American businesses."

According to the National Science Foundation, foreign students receive about half of all doctorates in engineering, mathematics, computer sciences, physics, and economics that are awarded in the United States. Unfortunately, growing backlogs in processing applications hamper the flexibility of U.S. employers to hire foreign-born talent with advanced degrees from American universities. These hurdles affect even doctoral graduates in STEM fields trained at U.S. universities, who either return home or seek employment in a country with a more welcoming immigration system. The loss of Ph.D. talent, trained at U.S. institutions and due to immigration red-tape, to our competitors makes little sense, and it harms our economy.

Researchers at Duke University and the University of California-Berkeley found that from 1995 to 2005, more than a quarter of engineering and technology companies started in the U.S. had at least one foreign-born founder, and in 2006, these companies employed 450,000 workers and produced \$52 billion in sales. This amendment is supported by COMPETE America, American Council on International Personnel, and TechAmerica.

I urge its adoption. This is important. We need to ensure that our economy is competitive moving forward, and we need to ensure that we have graduates in these STEM fields who can be here and lead these research efforts.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I rise to claim time in opposition to the amend-

ment, even though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of this good bipartisan amendment by my friend from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and Mr. QUIGLEY from Illinois.

This amendment recognizes the importance of attracting and retaining the best and brightest young scientists from around the world here to the United States. The ability of our Nation to innovate and to compete in a global economy is built on a foundation of basic research. Our universities' postdoctoral fellows, master's and Ph.D. students serve as the engine that drives our research enterprise. It is essential that we retain these STEM workers in the U.S.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment, which makes a bipartisan bill even better, and I think it's the reason, Madam Chair, that this bill has received so much support. Over 1,000 major organizations and companies have endorsed this bill. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Information Technology Industry Council, the Business Roundtable, the Council on Competitiveness, the National Venture Capital Association, TechAmerica, TechNet, Technology CEO Council, Telecommunications Industry Association, Energy Sciences Coalition, the Biotechnology Industry Association, on and on and on. So this is a good amendment to a good bill, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman, the chairman of the committee, for agreeing to accept his amendment and for his support of this initiative, and for the ability of our economy to keep those who will help lead them into the future and help ensure that jobs stay here as to the extent possible. I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. SALAZAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 51 printed in part B of House Report 111-479.

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 5116.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 51 offered by Mr. SALAZAR: Page 138, line 5, strike “and”.

Page 138, line 9, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 139, after line 9, insert the following new paragraph:

“(6) professional training for energy auditors, field technicians, and building contractors, in the areas of building energy retrofits and audits or related renewable energy technology installations.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1344, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Chair, I would like to thank Chairman GORDON for this wonderful bill that will actually create jobs. My amendment adds training for energy auditors, field technicians, and building contractors to promote the use of energy retrofits and energy-efficient technology to the list of programs that may be included in the Department of Energy’s STEM education activities.

Madam Chair, I have long been an advocate for clean energy and a balanced approach to meeting our energy needs while preserving our natural resources. As we continue to expand our use of renewable sources of energy, it is important that we have a well trained and knowledgeable workforce in place to take advantage of every job opportunity that is created.

Alternative energy is an economic boon for rural districts like the one I represent. The Third Congressional District of Colorado is leading the way with innovations in solar, wind, and woody biomass. In the San Luis Valley, where I live, there is currently an 8-megawatt solar farm with an additional 1,000 megawatts of solar in the works. However, it is critical to reduce the cost to America’s families and our impact on the environment that the men and women who build, repair, and refurbish our homes and infrastructure incorporate green technology in their operations.

In a recent study, scientists at the Department of Energy’s Berkeley Laboratory examined the workforce needs of the energy-efficiency services sector. They found that the rate of employment growth will depend in part on how effectively the Nation deploys training and education programs for the energy-efficiency workforce. It is estimated that the size of the energy-efficiency sector workforce is currently at about 120,000 full-time workers. That number would go as high as 400,000 when including part-time workers. If we want to ensure the growth of job opportunities, we must secure the training programs that will allow Americans to take advantage and excel in these fields. By doing so, we will not only take important steps to reduce energy consumption, but we will enhance national security by reducing

the country’s dependence on foreign sources of energy.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to lend their support to my amendment and the underlying legislation. The America COMPETES reauthorization is an important job creation tool, and will put the necessary funding and focus where it’s needed most.

With that, Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairwoman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALL of Texas. In addition to being too narrowly focused, I do not believe this type of activity is in the spirit of what STEM programs really should do at the department. Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Chair, this amendment is critical to creating the job force that would actually help increase the number of people that are trained for renewable and alternative energies.

With that, Madam Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee, Chairman GORDON.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chair, Mr. SALAZAR’s amendment would provide DOE with the authority to conduct training for energy auditors, field technicians, and building contractors so they can understand and promote the use of renewable energy and energy-efficiency technology. Energy efficiency and conservation will have the greatest near-term impact of any approach to our energy security and global climate change concerns.

Today’s buildings consume 40 percent of our country’s energy, more than any other sector of the U.S. economy. A new study by scientists at the Department of Energy’s Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory examined the workforce needs of the energy-efficiency service sector and found that there is a shortage of formal training programs in energy efficiency. This same study found that the building and construction trades and contractors have limited awareness of the energy-efficiency service sector. That is why this amendment adds technical training for energy professionals to the Department of Energy education programs authorized under this section, and it makes a good bipartisan bill even better.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. SCHOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 52 printed in part B of House Report 111-479.

Mr. SCHOCK. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 52 offered by Mr. SCHOCK: Page 191, after line 5, insert the following new paragraph (and redesignate subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

“(5) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary shall give special consideration to an eligible recipient who agrees to collaborate with local workforce investment area boards.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1344, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHOCK. Madam Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment to the America COMPETES Act, which ensures the innovative and intellectual prowess and technical minds of the currently unemployed are taken into account during the formation of the underlying regional innovation clusters.

While I have some reservations about the current overly broad language in this section of H.R. 5116, I nonetheless believe it is important to provide these regional innovation clusters with the best partnerships available. That is why I’m offering this amendment to instruct the Secretary of Commerce to give priority to those innovative clusters that work with local Workforce Investment Area, or commonly referred to WIA boards.

The WIA boards serve the unemployed by providing them with specific resources that help them improve their abilities and skills to get hired. Local WIA boards are typically known for hosting career fairs, providing continuing education assistance, and working on resume and job improvement strategies. WIA boards offer One-Stop Career Service Centers and take the time to get to know the unemployed citizens in their neighborhood. WIA boards are often on the front lines of providing assistance to unemployed workers. They are in the best position to know the demographics of those who have been let go from jobs and understand the skills that these displaced workers have.

□ 1045

In addition to helping individuals, WIA boards also work with employers to help them fill the jobs they have vacant.

In my hometown of Peoria, Illinois, the WIA board provided 19,094 individuals with career services last year, a 44 percent increase over the previous year. The WIA board has recently implemented a program called JobFit, which is a Web-based job matching and assessment tool that places individuals with companies that best suit their personality and skills. It is this type of matching service that will be vital to regional innovation clusters.

My amendment uses a similar concept by encouraging regional innovation clusters to partner with their local WIA board. WIA boards have been unsung heroes during these tough economic times, and I believe encouraging partnerships between the WIA boards and regional clusters will allow access to a well-trained workforce, which will have a positive impact on regional economic growth, and provide the expertise to bring many of these new manufacturing innovation and technology improvements into the marketplace.

If the purpose of the regional innovation clusters is to spur technological innovation, then the Workforce Investment Area boards will be able to provide employees whose skills those innovations require. The technology that will come to the marketplace will need a skilled workforce to utilize this technology. As such, local WIA can help to match the new technology with skilled employees who are looking for work.

At a time when the national unemployment rate is 9.9 percent, this commonsense amendment will utilize the skills of unemployed workers in order to keep America globally competitive. I urge adoption of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois for his outstanding amendment. It would instruct the Secretary of Commerce to give special consideration to innovation clusters that partner with local workforce investment boards. It makes a good bipartisan bill better.

I also want to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois for his recent win in the 3-mile Capitol Challenge. I think after 20 years it is a good thing we have a new winner, and I wish him good luck for the next 18 years.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHOCK. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GORDON OF TENNESSEE

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I have amendments en bloc at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 3 offered by Mr. GORDON of Tennessee consisting of amendments numbered 2, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 37, 40, 41, 45, 53, and 54 printed in part B of House Report 111-479:

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CARDOZA OF CALIFORNIA

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 174, after line 13, insert the following:  
**SEC. 412. GREEN MANUFACTURING AND CONSTRUCTION.**

The Director shall carry out a green manufacturing and construction initiative to—

(1) develop accurate sustainability metrics and practices for use in manufacturing;

(2) advance the development of standards and the creation of an information infrastructure to communicate sustainability information about suppliers; and

(3) improve energy performance, service life, and indoor air quality of new and retrofitted buildings through validated measurement data.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. MARSHALL OF GEORGIA

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 176, line 6, strike “within” insert the following: “, including those focused on the needs of small businesses and rural communities, within”.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. MICHAUD OF MAINE

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 194, strike lines 1 through 4 and insert the following:

“(2) COLLABORATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall explore and pursue collaboration with other Federal agencies, including through multi-agency funding opportunities, on regional innovation strategies.

“(B) SMALL BUSINESSES.—The Secretary shall ensure that such collaboration with Federal agencies prioritizes the needs and challenges of small businesses.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. MICHAUD OF MAINE

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 191, after line 5, insert the following:  
“(C) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary shall give special consideration to applications from regions that contain communities negatively impacted by trade.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. MICHAUD OF MAINE

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 131, line 22, insert before the semicolon the following: “, including the unique needs of schools in rural areas”.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. RUPPERSBERGER OF MARYLAND

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 102, line 3, insert “(a) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—” before “Section 10A”.

Page 102, after line 9, insert the following new subsection:

(b) RETIRING STEM PROFESSIONALS.—Section 10A of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 1862n-1a) is amended in subsection (a)(2)(A) by inserting “including retiring professionals in those fields,” after “mathematics professionals.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. RUPPERSBERGER OF MARYLAND

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 127, after line 13, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 256. CYBER-ENABLED LEARNING FOR NATIONAL CHALLENGES.**

The Director shall, in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, identify ways to use cyber-enabled learning to create an innovative STEM workforce and to help retrain and retain our existing STEM work-

force to address national challenges, including national security and competitiveness.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. ELLSWORTH OF INDIANA

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 246, after line 8, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 704. LIMITATION.**

No funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or the amendments made by this Act may be used to purchase gift items, knickknacks, souvenirs, trinkets, or other items without direct educational value.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. HEINRICH OF NEW MEXICO

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 189, line 11, strike “partnership” and insert “partnership, a science park, a Federal laboratory”.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. HEINRICH OF NEW MEXICO

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 245, after line 2, insert the following:

**Subtitle E—Technology Transfer Database**

**SEC. 651. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER DATABASE.**

To support the commercial application of new energy technologies development by the Department of Energy, the Secretary of Energy may establish an online database of technologies, capabilities, and resources available to the public at the National Laboratories.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 133, line 25, strike “and”.

Page 133, after line 25, insert the following new clause:

“(vi) marine and hydrokinetic technology systems; and

Page 135, line 23, strike “and”.

Page 135, after line 23, insert the following new clause:

“(vi) marine and hydrokinetic technology systems; and

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. SPACE OF OHIO

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 174, after line 13, insert the following:

**SEC. 412. MANUFACTURING RESEARCH.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall carry out a program to support transformational manufacturing research.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—As part of such program, the Director shall—

(1) develop and disseminate measurement tools and capabilities for new additive manufacturing and robotics technologies and methods;

(2) establish new techniques and methods to efficiently generate and assemble products integrating nanoscale materials and devices; and

(3) carry out other research with significant transformational potential for manufacturing.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MS. TITUS OF NEVADA

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 121, beginning on line 7, strike “STEM teacher professional development” and insert “pre-service and in-service STEM teacher training and professional development”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1344, the gentleman



from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chair, this is a very good en bloc set of amendments that again makes this bipartisan bill even better. I think one of the byproducts of having such a very good bill is we have so many organizations, over a thousand organizations and major companies that have endorsed the bill, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, Information Technology Industry Council, Business Roundtable, Council on Competitiveness, National Venture Capital Association, TechAmerica, TechNet, Technology CEO Council, the Telecommunication Industry Association, the Biotechnology Industry Association, the Aerospace Industries Association, the Computing Technology Industry Association, the Fabricators & Manufacturers Association, the National Defense Industrial Association, the National Electrical Manufacturers Association. I can go on and on.

In the university area, the American Council on Education, the Association of American Colleges and Universities, Association of American Public Universities, Association of Public and Land-grant Universities.

This is a very important bill for our country and it is for our competitiveness and for our kids and grandkids, and it is going to create jobs in the short term, in the intermediate term, and in the long term.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Most of the 13 amendments rolled into this en bloc package are minor and noncontroversial, and we are generally supportive.

I do, however, want to make comments regarding potential issues with two of these amendments: Cardoza amendment No. 2 and Heinrich amendment No. 59. I note some concern regarding the Heinrich amendment included in this en bloc, which makes Federal laboratories eligible grant recipients under the regional innovation cluster programs.

While it would be appropriate for entities such as DOE national laboratories to compete for and receive the type of funding called for in the clusters program, the definition of "Federal laboratories" goes far beyond this. It could include almost any agency laboratory and essentially result in taxpayer funding from one Federal agency being redistributed to a different Federal agency. There are a host of problems with this, but first and foremost, it is clearly not an ideal way to fund innovation.

I want to note these concerns regarding the amendment for the record, although I do not plan to oppose the entire en bloc that includes this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA).

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, while unemployment is still at a record high in my district, the reauthorization of the America COMPETES Act is an important opportunity for us to invest in creating a brighter, more resilient economic future.

Manufacturing is leading the early stages of the recovery in California. In fact, I am told that next year could bring the first annual increase in California manufacturing employment in a decade.

Madam Chair, now is the time for us to support the manufacturing sector in our country. Energy costs are rising and consumer demand is up for sustainable products. Sustainability will be a key element for keeping our manufacturing sector competitive. Even now, manufacturers are trying to find ways to incorporate emerging sustainable technologies into their businesses.

My amendment will help manufacturers respond quickly and effectively to the demand for more sustainable practices by instructing the NIST Director to carry out a green manufacturing and construction initiative that gives manufacturers the information they need to make sound, science-based sustainable investments.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense amendment. I understand that my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) does have some concerns, and I anticipate that he might want to engage in a colloquy, and I stand ready to do that with the gentleman from Texas.

Madam Chair, while unemployment is still at a record high in my district, the reauthorization of the America COMPETES Act is an important opportunity for us to invest in creating a brighter, more resilient economic future.

The University of California, Merced campus in my district has received millions of Research and Development dollars that are being used to develop new technologies and to train a new generation of scientists, engineers, and teachers.

As this new technology is developed, it is also in our nation's best interests to make sure that we find ways to make it profitable for our businesses to implement.

Last month, the University of the Pacific published its California Business Forecast report.

And, with the notable exception of Toyota's NUMMI plant closure, manufacturing is leading the early stages of the economic recovery in California.

In fact, next year could bring the first annual increase in California manufacturing employment in a decade.

Madam Chair, now is the time to support the manufacturing sector in our country.

Energy costs are rising and consumer demand is up for sustainable products.

Sustainability will be one important element for keeping our manufacturing sector competitive.

Even now, manufacturers are trying to find ways to incorporate emerging sustainable technology into their business practices.

The Sun Chips plant in my district in the City of Modesto is a leader in utilizing sustainable technology.

It is cutting back on its environmental impact by using a solar collector field to produce thermal energy to make its snacks.

My amendment will help other companies embrace similar sustainability goals and make a profit because of it.

It will help other manufacturers respond quickly and effectively to the demand for more sustainable practices by instructing the National Institute of Standards and Technology Director to carry out a green manufacturing and construction initiative that gives manufacturers the information they need to make sound, science-based sustainable investments.

There are more than 335,000 manufacturing plants in the United States, and my amendment will give them the information they need to adopt the best sustainable practices and to be technologically competitive in the twenty-first century.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this common sense amendment.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chair, the Cardoza amendment directs NIST to carry out a green manufacturing and construction initiative. While I understand NIST already funds some research in this area, I do have a concern about the intent of some of the language in the amendment. Accordingly, I have asked that the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) engage in a colloquy to clarify this for the record.

Paragraph 2 of this amendment directs NIST to advance the "creation of an information infrastructure to communicate sustainability information about suppliers." It is accurate, I think, to say that this language does not mean that NIST should characterize specific suppliers' sustainability practices but, rather, will simply "make information available to manufacturers so they can make informed and science-based decisions to assess their products and supply chain."

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Chair, yes, that interpretation is correct, and I thank the gentleman for his colloquy.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

The Cardoza amendment directs NIST to carry out a green manufacturing and construction initiative. While I understand NIST already funds some research in this area, I do not have a concern about the intent. I think the colloquy has been appropriate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a constructive player in this good bill.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Chair, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the committee. This body is going to miss the distinguished chairman of the committee. He has always operated in a bipartisan fashion and has provided thoughtful



and compelling leadership on issues of science and technology so badly needed in our country.

This bill really is a very thoughtful bill that comes at a critical point. The United States has been seeing erosion in its preeminence in the field of innovation in science and technology. This bill is designed to sort of address that in a very creative way itself. It provides for more funding of basic research in the United States. We know that basic research leads to inventions, patents, improvements in manufacturing processes that can really make a difference in the quality of our lives. The technology we live with and take for granted today didn't exist 30 years ago, and it has transformed America and it has transformed the world, thanks in many, many ways to the basic research investments the United States Federal Government made some time ago.

This bill allows us to tap into the research already underway in the NIST labs, for example, and that is a real challenge. I can tell you as somebody who spent 20 years in the private sector in the technology field, often people doing research aren't the ones who necessarily can always see the myriad application of that research in the marketplace. So the need to be able to recognize the application of research and to help in the commercialization of that research to improve lives and to improve America's competitiveness is really something we need more of. This bill helps do that.

I had two amendments with my colleagues, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. KRATOVIL), which address the underlying education piece of this bill which is so important. We are not producing sufficient numbers of engineers and scientists and technologists for the future in the United States. We need to tap into the talent that is there.

I have spent a lot of time in my district helping to support robotics competition teams in high schools. The excitement of those young students in being able to get hands-on experience in research and development and in the application of that research and development in the form of a competition with robotics technology was a marvel to behold.

Kingman Brewster, the late president of Yale University, once said: Without excitement, there is no learning. There was lots of excitement on the part of these high school students in the robotics research, and as a result there was a lot of learning, and a lot of future engineers and technologists and scientists as a result. This bill will help us tap into that talent.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Madam Chair, I thank Chairman GORDON for his leadership on

this important legislation that will strengthen American competitiveness.

I rise today in support of my amendment, which is part of the en bloc amendment, which clarifies that both preservice and in-service teacher training and professional development shall be considered when identifying the grand challenges in pre-K through 12 STEM education.

□ 1100

For our country to be economically competitive in the 21st century, we must ensure that all of our students have a strong foundation in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, the STEM fields. The underlying bill before us recognizes this fact and instructs the director of the National Science Foundation and the Secretary of Education to work together to identify the grand challenges in STEM education and how to best address them.

While the bill currently includes the effectiveness of STEM teacher professional development as a subject to be studied as a grand challenge, the bill does not mention the training that soon-to-be-teachers receive before they enter the classroom. My amendment highlights the fact that teacher preservice and training preparation programs have an important part to play in ensuring that future teachers will be well-equipped to give our students a strong foundation in the STEM fields.

Teacher preparations generally provide future teachers with the knowledge and skills they need to be effective classroom instructors, so we must be sure that that includes preparation they need to teach the STEM subjects. Future teachers must be educated in the latest technology, the newest theories, the cutting-edge developments in the STEM fields so they can give our students the tools they need to compete in the global economy. My amendment therefore directs that pre-service teacher training and professional development shall also be considered when addressing the grand challenges of K-12 STEM education.

So I would urge my colleagues to support this important bill, to support this en bloc amendment, and to help prepare our teachers to prepare our children for the jobs of tomorrow.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I reserve my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlelady from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS), a new member of our Science and Technology Committee, but one that has made a great contribution in a short time.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Madam Chairman, I would like to first say thank you very much to our Chairman GORDON, who's been a really tremendous leader, and especially as we move forward. What I think is—I know it's the America COMPETES Act—but I think of it as the 21st-century America COMPETES Act. And it's also been

quite a pleasure to work with Ranking Member HALL as well on getting this to the floor.

I'm a strong supporter of America COMPETES, and it's pretty simple: either we're going to be in the 21st century competitive with nations around the world, or not. And I believe the America COMPETES Act, this en bloc amendment, and specifically several amendments, I think really strengthen what we've been able to achieve in our Science and Technology Committee.

The COMPETES Act I think is one of the most important votes we're going to take in this Congress, and we're fortunate to be able to do work that really is about the future. Too often here in the Congress we have to do things that are just about the short term. And right here we have a vision that's really about the next decade and about whether we're going to be competitive, and whether all of our people, our young people, will be competitive, about whether we're going to create the Ph.D.s that are on the cutting edge of the next innovations for the 21st century, about whether we'll have businesses and our manufacturing sector that really is engaged in this century, not the old manufacturing of the 20th century, but the new manufacturing of the 21st century, around energy, around green technologies. And this is what America COMPETES is about.

I want to tell you a little bit about an experience I had just 2 weeks ago. It was on a Saturday morning; and every Saturday morning, for the last several months, a group of elementary school students, middle school students, and high school students gathered at Bladensburg High School out in my congressional district, part of a CSTEM program, part of a challenge program, working with each other collaboratively, the young people learning from the older students, working on projects that would enable them to really become critical thinkers in science, technology, engineering and math, working on robotics together, with a group of teachers who volunteer their time every Saturday morning to work with these young people.

And you know how they did it? They did it because they're part of America COMPETES. And this is what I think needs to happen in every classroom across the country, from pre-kindergarten to high school and on to the upper grades.

Now, this group of students was able to compete in the CSTEM challenge in Houston just a week ago, and they competed with young people all across this country in those early year, elementary years through high school years. And it was a rewarding experience for them. I think that America COMPETES is about that set of young people because we don't know, in that room, which of those young people who get the benefit of learning to experience science and technology and to grab it at an early age, we don't know which ones of those young people will

be on the cutting edge of the next innovation that's going to propel us even into the next century.

And so I'm excited about being here today to support the America COMPETES Act and support a number of amendments that I think really strengthen what we're doing, particularly the amendment offered by my colleague DINA TITUS from Nevada that really is looking in a very systemic way at what happens between kindergarten and 12th grade.

What we know is that when we invest in young people at the earliest age and get them the kind of teachers that they need in the classroom, it is not when they get into college that they decide they want to take on science and technology. They make those decisions and they get prepared from kindergarten to fourth grade, and so what we're doing here really strengthens our ability for competition.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I yield the gentlelady 30 seconds more.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. And, finally, looking at what we're doing in the manufacturing sector, we have amendments that strengthen the manufacturing extension partnerships that really allow the National Institutes of Standards and Technology in my congressional district to better reflect the needs and challenges facing manufacturers today.

And so I urge my colleagues to support the underlying bill, to support the en bloc amendments, and to propel us into the 21st century to be competitive with nations around the world.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), a cardinal on the very important Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FATTAH. I want to congratulate the chairman of the committee and the sponsor of this important piece of legislation. BART GORDON has done our country a great service through his work, both in the original authorization and now in this reauthorization, and his staff and members of the committee.

I rise to support the America COMPETES Act. I think that the Energy Innovation Hubs, the focus on STEM education and innovation represent in important ways the very future of our economy. As we go forward, we will look back on this day as a very important day in terms of laying the foundation for protecting and enhancing the American standard of living.

I'm reminded, hearing the gentlelady from Maryland speak, of a group of young people in my district who have won the Tour de Sol three times, who are now in the final grouping competing worldwide for the X prize, developing a car that can go 100 miles an hour.

Now, these young people are the only high school team out of 100 teams that started this enterprise fighting, competing against colleges, universities, professional entities that own worldwide car companies, but they have been ranked by Popular Mechanics as one of the top 10 finalists that will probably win the X prize.

But we've seen in robotics and engineering and science that our young people have the ability to compete. We need to foster their sense of innovation and not have them be risk averse.

This bill and its work in this area of STEM education is so vitally important. I want to thank the gentlelady, Congresswoman FUDGE from Ohio, for her work, and the chairman for making sure that STEM education got the kind of focus, laser-like focus, it needed in this legislation. The ranking member has done a great job.

This is a great day, a bipartisan piece of legislation that invests in creating future jobs in our economy through the one thing that we know is indispensable to make this world a better place, and that's American ingenuity, innovation. This invests in it. And BART GORDON, this great Congressman has done our country a great service, and I want to thank him for his leadership in this effort.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, we're coming to the end of the discussion on this bill, so let me just—again, I want to thank the staff, the minority and majority staff, the Members who have put so much time into this. This is not only a good substantive bill; it is a good bill by process. We had 46 hearings on this bill resulting in three different subcommittee bipartisan markups that went to a full committee bipartisan markup, which brought this bill to the floor today.

This is a good bill. In 2007, the original authorization received 367 Members that voted for it. I hope that we will be able to see that same type of vote again.

Then it went to the United States Senate because this is not only a bipartisan bill; it is a bicameral bill. In the United States Senate there were 69 cosponsors, and it received a unanimous vote on the Senate—on the other body's floor. Much of that credit goes to LAMAR ALEXANDER from Tennessee and JEFF BINGAMAN. And I told LAMAR ALEXANDER the other day that if he can get 69 cosponsors again and get a unanimous vote, that I will nominate him for the Nobel Peace Prize and special envoy to the Mid East. He did yeoman's work, and I'm sure he will do it again. This is a good bipartisan bill and should get a good bipartisan vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I would like simply to conclude by reiterating some key points about

H.R. 5116, the America COMPETES Act of 2010. I've said on numerous occasions that we should support strengthening investments in basic research and science, technology, engineering and mathematics education. National investments in basic R&D and STEM education, together with sound economic policies form the policy basis of what's necessary for the country to truly remain competitive in the future.

I can't support this bill, however, because it calls for excessive spending levels, numerous new and duplicative programs, ineffective oversight and positive shifts that could lead to the government picking "winners and losers."

It's for these reasons that the National Taxpayers Union and the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste have come out against this bill. I would urge Members to vote "no" on H.R. 5116.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, has my time expired?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee has yielded back his time. Does the gentleman from Tennessee seek to reclaim his time?

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Yes, Madam Chairman.

□ 1115

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I will just reclaim a small part of it. I just want to thank my ranking member, Mr. HALL from Texas, for the gentlemanly way that he has conducted himself today and in all of our meetings. Maybe it is because I am from Tennessee and he is from Texas, but we share a lot of the same views. We have the same interest in seeing that our country move forward in this 21st century.

I don't have grandkids yet, but I know that for his kids and grandkids he wants to see us move forward. For my 9-year-old daughter I want to see us move forward. As I say, we agree most of the time. Every now and then we don't. But no one could have a better partner, and I thank him for his cooperation on this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON).

The amendments en bloc were agreed to.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of the House Report 111-479 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 34, by Mr. BOCCIERI of Ohio;

Amendment No. 38 by Mrs. HALVORSON of Illinois;

Amendment No. 50 by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. BOCCIERI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 171, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]

#### AYES—248

Ackerman	Donnelly (IN)	Langevin
Altmire	Drieaus	Larsen (WA)
Andrews	Edwards (MD)	Larson (CT)
Arcuri	Edwards (TX)	Lee (CA)
Baca	Ehlers	Levin
Baird	Ellison	Lewis (GA)
Baldwin	Ellsworth	Lipinski
Barrow	Engel	Loebsack
Bean	Eshoo	Loftgren, Zoe
Becerra	Etheridge	Lowe
Berkley	Faleomavaega	Lujan
Berman	Farr	Lynch
Berry	Fattah	Maffei
Bishop (GA)	Filner	Maloney
Bishop (NY)	Foster	Markey (CO)
Blumenauer	Frank (MA)	Markey (MA)
Bocieri	Fudge	Marshall
Bordallo	Garamendi	Matheson
Boren	Giffords	Matsui
Boswell	Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)
Boucher	Gordon (TN)	McCollum
Boyd	Grayson	McDermott
Brady (PA)	Green, Al	McGovern
Braley (IA)	Green, Gene	McIntyre
Bright	Grijalva	McMahon
Brown, Corrine	Gutierrez	McNerney
Butterfield	Hall (NY)	Meek (FL)
Capps	Halvorson	Meeks (NY)
Capuano	Hare	Melancon
Cardoza	Harman	Michaud
Carnahan	Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)
Carson (IN)	Heinrich	Miller, George
Castor (FL)	Herseeth Sandlin	Minnick
Chandler	Hill	Mitchell
Childers	Himes	Mollohan
Chu	Hinche	Moore (KS)
Clarke	Hinojosa	Moore (WI)
Clay	Hirono	Moran (VA)
Cleaver	Hodes	Murphy (CT)
Clyburn	Holden	Murphy (NY)
Cohen	Holt	Murphy, Patrick
Connolly (VA)	Hoyer	Nadler (NY)
Conyers	Inslee	Napolitano
Cooper	Israel	Neal (MA)
Costa	Jackson (IL)	Norton
Costello	Jackson Lee	Nye
Courtney	(TX)	Oberstar
Crowley	Johnson (GA)	Obey
Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Olver
Cummings	Kagen	Ortiz
Dahlkemper	Kanjorski	Pallone
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Pascrell
Davis (IL)	Kennedy	Pastor (AZ)
Davis (TN)	Kildee	Payne
DeFazio	Kilpatrick (MI)	Perlmutter
DeGette	Kilroy	Perriello
Delahunt	Kind	Peters
DeLauro	Kissell	Peterson
Deutch	Klein (FL)	Pierluisi
Dicks	Kosmas	Pingree (ME)
Dingell	Kratovil	Polis (CO)
Doggett	Kucinich	Pomeroy

Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Rodriguez  
Ross  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Sablan  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schauer  
Schiff  
Schmidt

Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sestak  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Skelton  
Smith (WA)  
Ryan (OH)  
Space  
Speier  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Taylor  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)

Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch  
Wilson (OH)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth

So the amendment was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MRS. HALVORSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. HALVORSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 419, noes 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 268]

#### AYES—419

Ackerman	Cardoza	Filner
Aderholt	Carnahan	Flake
Adler (NJ)	Carson (IN)	Fleming
Akin	Carter	Forbes
Alexander	Cassidy	Fortenberry
Altmire	Castle	Foster
Andrews	Castor (FL)	Fox
Arcuri	Chaffetz	Frank (MA)
Austria	Chandler	Franks (AZ)
Baca	Childers	Frelinghuysen
Bachmann	Chu	Fudge
Bachus	Clarke	Gallagher
Baird	Clay	Garamendi
Baldwin	Cleaver	Garrett (NJ)
Barrow	Clyburn	Gerlach
Bartlett	Coble	Giffords
Barton (TX)	Coffman (CO)	Gingrey (GA)
Bean	Cohen	Gohmert
Becerra	Conaway	Gonzalez
Berkley	Connolly (VA)	Goodlatte
Berman	Conyers	Gordon (TN)
Berry	Cooper	Granger
Biggert	Costa	Graves
Bilbray	Costello	Grayson
Bilirakis	Courtney	Green, Al
Bishop (GA)	Crenshaw	Green, Gene
Bishop (NY)	Crowley	Griffith
Blackburn	Cuellar	Grijalva
Blumenauer	Culberson	Guthrie
Blunt	Cummings	Gutierrez
Bocieri	Dahlkemper	Hall (NY)
Boehner	Davis (CA)	Hall (TX)
Bonner	Davis (IL)	Halvorson
Bono Mack	Davis (KY)	Hare
Boozman	Davis (TN)	Harman
Bordallo	DeFazio	Harper
Boren	DeGette	Hastings (FL)
Boswell	Delahunt	Hastings (WA)
Boucher	DeLauro	Heinrich
Boustany	Dent	Heller
Boyd	Deutch	Hensarling
Brady (PA)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Herger
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Herseeth Sandlin
Braley (IA)	Dicks	Hill
Bright	Dingell	Himes
Broun (GA)	Doggett	Hinche
Brown (SC)	Donnelly (IN)	Hinojosa
Brown, Corrine	Dreier	Hirono
Brown-Waite,	Drieaus	Hodes
Ginny	Duncan	Holden
Buchanan	Edwards (MD)	Holt
Burgess	Edwards (TX)	Honda
Burton (IN)	Ehlers	Hoyer
Butterfield	Ellison	Hunter
Buyer	Ellsworth	Inglis
Calvert	Emerson	Inslee
Camp	Engel	Israel
Campbell	Eshoo	Issa
Cantor	Etheridge	Jackson (IL)
Cao	Faleomavaega	Jackson Lee
Capito	Fallin	(TX)
Capps	Farr	Jenkins
Capuano	Fattah	Johnson (GA)

#### NOES—171

Aderholt  
Adler (NJ)  
Akin  
Alexander  
Austria  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Cao  
Capito  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Castle  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Conaway  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Emerson  
Fallin  
Flake  
Fleming  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly

Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Granger  
Graves  
Griffith  
Guthrie  
Hall (TX)  
Harper  
Hastings (WA)  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hunter  
Inglis  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan (OH)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kirkpatrick (AZ)  
Kline (MN)  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaull  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Moran (KS)

Murphy, Tim  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Olson  
Owens  
Paul  
Paulsen  
Pence  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schock  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Turner  
Upton  
Walden  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

#### NOT VOTING—17

Barrett (SC)  
Bishop (UT)  
Carney  
Christensen  
Cole  
Davis (AL)

Diaz-Balart, L.  
Doyle  
Higgins  
Hoekstra  
Honda  
Lee (NY)

Rush  
Serrano  
Slaughter  
Teague  
Wamp

□ 1145

Messrs. DAVIS of Kentucky, SCALISE, LATHAM, CALVERT, and ADLER of New Jersey changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. BRIGHT changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

Johnson (IL)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones  
 Jordan (OH)  
 Kagen  
 Kanjorski  
 Kaptur  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilpatrick (MI)  
 Kilroy  
 Kind  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kingston  
 Kirk  
 Kirkpatrick (AZ)  
 Kissell  
 Klein (FL)  
 Kline (MN)  
 Kosmas  
 Kratovil  
 Kucinich  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Latham  
 LaTourette  
 Latta  
 Lee (CA)  
 Levin  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Linder  
 Lipinski  
 LoBlondo  
 Loeb sack  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Lowey  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Luján  
 Lummis  
 Lungren, Daniel  
 E.  
 Lynch  
 Mack  
 Maffei  
 Maloney  
 Manzullo  
 Marchant  
 Markey (CO)  
 Markey (MA)  
 Marshall  
 Matheson  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (CA)  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McCollum  
 McCotter  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McHenry  
 McIntyre  
 McKeon  
 McMahon  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McNerney  
 Meek (FL)  
 Meeks (NY)  
 Melancon  
 Mica  
 Michaud

Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller (NC)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Miller, George  
 Minnick  
 Mitchell  
 Mollohan  
 Moore (KS)  
 Moore (WI)  
 Moran (KS)  
 Moran (VA)  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Murphy (NY)  
 Murphy, Patrick  
 Murphy, Tim  
 Myrick  
 Nadler (NY)  
 Napolitano  
 Neal (MA)  
 Neugebauer  
 Norton  
 Nunes  
 Nye  
 Oberstar  
 Obey  
 Olson  
 Oliver  
 Ortiz  
 Owens  
 Pallone  
 Pascarelli  
 Pastor (AZ)  
 Paul  
 Paulsen  
 Payne  
 Perlmutter  
 Perriello  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Petri  
 Pierluisi  
 Pingree (ME)  
 Pitts  
 Platts  
 Poe (TX)  
 Polis (CO)  
 Pomeroy  
 Posey  
 Price (GA)  
 Price (NC)  
 Putnam  
 Quigley  
 Radanovich  
 Rahall  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Reyes  
 Richardson  
 Rodriguez  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rooney  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Rothman (NJ)  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Sablan  
 Salazar  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.

## NOT VOTING—17

Barrett (SC)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Carney  
 Christensen  
 Cole  
 Davis (AL)

Doyle  
 Higgins  
 Hoekstra  
 Lee (NY)  
 Pence  
 Rangel

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 There are 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1153

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 419, noes 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 269]

## AYES—419

Ackerman  
 Aderholt  
 Adler (NJ)  
 Akin  
 Alexander  
 Altmire  
 Andrews  
 Arcuri  
 Austria  
 Baca  
 Bachmann  
 Bachus  
 Baird  
 Baldwin  
 Barrow  
 Bartlett  
 Barton (TX)  
 Bean  
 Becerra  
 Berkley  
 Berman  
 Berry  
 Biggert  
 Bilbray  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Blackburn  
 Blumenauer  
 Blunt  
 Boccieri  
 Boehner  
 Bonner  
 Bono Mack  
 Boozman  
 Bordallo  
 Boren  
 Boswell  
 Boucher  
 Boustany  
 Boyd  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brady (TX)  
 Braley (IA)  
 Bright  
 Broun (GA)  
 Brown (SC)  
 Brown, Corrine  
 Brown-Waite,  
 Ginny  
 Buchanan  
 Burgess  
 Burton (IN)  
 Butterfield  
 Buyer  
 Calvert  
 Campbell  
 Cantor  
 Cao  
 Capito  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Cardoza  
 Carnahan  
 Carney  
 Carson (IN)  
 Carter  
 Cassidy

Castle  
 Castor (FL)  
 Chaffetz  
 Chandler  
 Childers  
 Chu  
 Clarke  
 Clay  
 Clyburn  
 Coble  
 Coffman (CO)  
 Cohen  
 Conaway  
 Connolly (VA)  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Costello  
 Courtney  
 Crenshaw  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Culberson  
 Cummings  
 Dahlkemper  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (IL)  
 Davis (KY)  
 Davis (TN)  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delahunt  
 DeLauro  
 Dent  
 Deutch  
 Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Donnelly (IN)  
 Dreier  
 Driehaus  
 Duncan  
 Edwards (MD)  
 Edwards (TX)  
 Ehlers  
 Ellison  
 Ellsworth  
 Emerson  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Etheridge  
 Faleomavaega  
 Fallin  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Filner  
 Flake  
 Fleming  
 Forbes  
 Fortenberry  
 Foster  
 Foxx  
 Frank (MA)  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Fudge  
 Gallegly

Kissell  
 Klein (FL)  
 Kline (MN)  
 Kosmas  
 Kratovil  
 Kucinich  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Latham  
 LaTourette  
 Latta  
 Lee (CA)  
 Levin  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Linder  
 Lipinski  
 LoBlondo  
 Loeb sack  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Lowey  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Luján  
 Lummis  
 Lungren, Daniel  
 E.  
 Lynch  
 Mack  
 Maffei  
 Maloney  
 Manzullo  
 Marchant  
 Gohmert  
 Gonzalez  
 Goodlatte  
 Gordon (TN)  
 Granger  
 Graves  
 Grayson  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Griffith  
 Grijalva  
 Guthrie  
 Gutierrez  
 Hall (NY)  
 Hall (TX)  
 Halvorson  
 Hare  
 Harman  
 Harper  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Heinrich  
 Heller  
 Hensarling  
 Herger  
 Herseth Sandlin  
 Hill  
 Himes  
 Hinchey  
 Hinojosa  
 Hirono  
 Hodes  
 Holden  
 Holt  
 Honda  
 Hoyer  
 Hunter  
 Inglis  
 Inslee  
 Israel  
 Issa  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jackson Lee  
 (TX)  
 Jenkins  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson (IL)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones  
 Jordan (OH)  
 Kagen  
 Kanjorski  
 Kaptur  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilpatrick (MI)  
 Kilroy  
 Kind  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kingston  
 Kirk  
 Kirkpatrick (AZ)

Murphy (CT)  
 Murphy (NY)  
 Murphy, Patrick  
 Murphy, Tim  
 Myrick  
 Nadler (NY)  
 Napolitano  
 Neal (MA)  
 Neugebauer  
 Norton  
 Nunes  
 Nye  
 Oberstar  
 Obey  
 Olson  
 Oliver  
 Ortiz  
 Owens  
 Pallone  
 Pascarelli  
 Pastor (AZ)  
 Paul  
 Paulsen  
 Payne  
 Pence  
 Perlmutter  
 Perriello  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Petri  
 Pierluisi  
 Pingree (ME)  
 Platts  
 Poe (TX)  
 Polis (CO)  
 Pomeroy  
 Posey  
 Price (GA)  
 Price (NC)  
 Putnam  
 Quigley  
 Rahall  
 Rangel  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Reyes  
 Richardson  
 Rodriguez  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rooney  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Rothman (NJ)  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Sablan  
 Salazar  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Scalise  
 Schakowsky  
 Schauer  
 Schiff

## NOT VOTING—17

Barrett (SC)  
 Camp  
 Christensen  
 Cleaver  
 Cole  
 Davis (AL)  
 Doyle  
 Higgins  
 Hoekstra  
 Lee (NY)  
 Pitts  
 Radanovich

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1201

So the amendment was agreed to.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PAS-TOR of Arizona) having assumed the chair, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5116) to invest in innovation through research and development, to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1344, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HALL of Texas. I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HALL of Texas. moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5116 to the Committee on Science and Technology with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike page 91, line 9, through page 98, line 4.

Strike page 163, line 3, through page 164, line 11.

Strike page 176, line 15, through page 187, line 13.

Strike page 187, line 14, through page 195, line 11.

Strike page 235, line 15, through page 244, line 1.

Page 245, lines 12 through 24, amend section 702 to read as follows:

#### SEC. 702. PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES.

For the purposes of the activities and programs supported by this Act and the amendments made by this Act—

(1) institutions of higher education chartered to serve large numbers of students with disabilities, including Gallaudet University, Landmark College, and the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, and institutions of higher education offering science, technology, engineering, and mathematics research and education activities and programs available to veterans with disabilities, shall receive special consideration and have a designation consistent with the designation for other institutions that serve populations underrepresented in STEM to ensure that institutions of higher education chartered to serve or serving persons with disabilities benefit from such research and education activities and programs; and

(2) agencies for which appropriations are authorized by this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall also conduct outreach to veterans with disabilities pursuing studies in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics to ensure that such veterans are aware of and benefit from the research and education activities and programs authorized by this Act.

At the end of the bill, insert the following new sections:

#### SEC. 704. NO SALARIES FOR VIEWING PORNOGRAPHY.

None of the funds authorized under this Act may be used to pay the salary of any individual who has been officially disciplined for violations of subpart G of the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch for viewing, downloading, or exchanging pornography, including child pornography, on a Federal Government computer or while performing official Federal Government duties.

#### SEC. 705. INELIGIBILITY FOR AWARDS OR GRANTS.

None of the funds authorized under this Act shall be available to make awards to or provide grants for an institution of higher education under this Act if that institution is prevented from receiving funds for contracts or grants for education under section 983 of title 10, United States Code.

#### SEC. 706. ALTERNATIVE AUTHORIZATIONS.

Notwithstanding sections 212, 402, 611, and 622, in any year following a year in which there is a Federal budget deficit the authorization levels in those sections and the amendments made by those sections shall be in the amount specified as follows:

(1) ALTERNATIVE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation \$6,872,510,400 for each of the fiscal years 2011 through 2013.

(B) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized under subparagraph (A) for each fiscal year—

(i) \$5,563,920,400 shall be made available for research and related activities;

(ii) \$872,760,000 shall be made available for education and human resources;

(iii) \$117,290,000 shall be made available for major research equipment and facilities construction;

(iv) \$300,000,000 shall be made available for agency operations and award management;

(v) \$4,540,000 shall be made available for the Office of the National Science Board; and

(vi) \$14,000,000 shall be made available for the Office of Inspector General.

(2) ALTERNATIVE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce \$839,300,000 for the National Institute of Standards and Technology for each of the fiscal years 2011 through 2013.

(B) SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.—Of the amount authorized under subparagraph (A) for each fiscal year—

(i) \$515,000,000 shall be authorized for scientific and technical research and services laboratory activities;

(ii) \$120,000,000 shall be authorized for the construction and maintenance of facilities; and

(iii) \$204,300,000 shall be authorized for industrial technology services activities, of which—

(I) \$70,000,000 shall be authorized for the Technology Innovation Program under section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n);

(II) \$124,700,000 shall be authorized for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership pro-

gram under sections 25 and 26 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 278k and 278l); and

(III) \$9,600,000 shall be authorized for the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award program under section 17 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3711a).

(3) ALTERNATIVE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for the activities of the Office of Science \$4,904,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2011 through 2013, of which for each fiscal year—

(A) \$1,637,000,000 shall be for Basic Energy Sciences activities under section 604;

(B) \$604,000,000 shall be for Biological and Environmental Research activities under section 605; and

(C) \$394,000,000 shall be for Advanced Scientific Computing Research activities under section 606.

(4) ALTERNATIVE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR ARPA-E.—No funds are authorized to be appropriated to the Director of ARPA-E for deposit into the Fund for fiscal years 2011 through 2013.

Mr. HALL of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few points about the motion to recommit before I hand it over to the gentlewoman from Kansas.

The motion to recommit addresses the biggest concern I, and many of the Members on this side of the aisle, have with the legislation, which is the excessive spending. It will address this issue by reducing the authorization to 3 years instead of 5, striking the new programs in the bill, and reducing the spending down to the fiscal year 2010 appropriated levels. It also would prohibit Federal funds from being used by Federal employees to view, download, or exchange pornography, including child pornography. Additionally, it will ensure that the institutions that we're giving Federal funding to through this act will repay the Federal Government by allowing the military onto their campuses for recruitment.

Finally, the motion to recommit will invest in an issue that's very dear to our hearts, our Nation's disabled veterans. This motion would ensure that our colleges and universities that make STEM programs available to our disabled veterans and those schools chartered to serve disabled veterans receive the same special consideration afforded to other schools serving the underrepresented populations.

A much broader version of this language was unanimously accepted at the

committee level. A very watered down version that does not stand the chance of helping a single veteran is included in the manager's amendment. And this compromise language filed at Rules was not made in order for consideration.

I cannot for the life of me understand why there's a resistance to assisting the Nation's disabled veterans. Of the 3.1 million disabled veterans in this country, over 50,000 are currently training to receive undergraduate degrees and an additional 2,800 participate in graduate school programs. The schools serving these men and women deserve the same consideration as those assisting other underrepresented populations. But there's not one school in the Nation that would meet the standards created by the language in the manager's amendment.

□ 1215

I don't buy the argument that this special consideration will open a floodgate of eligible schools, providing no guarantee that the disabled veterans will actually benefit from the funding. There are already several hundred well-known and -respected schools that qualify for special consideration under a variety of statutes for underrepresented populations with no guarantee that a particular grant would benefit a designated group. Why shouldn't those schools helping our disabled veterans have the same consideration?

Frankly, it should not matter how many disabled veterans a school enrolls. These fine young men and women, who every one of us will see over Memorial Day, have made tremendous personal sacrifices for us. The Speaker rightfully has us bow our heads in silence once a month to honor them. We should also be lifting our chins and our praise and our gratitude to those who cross foreign borders to ensure that everyone within our own are free. This is but a small way we can show our appreciation not only to them, but to the schools that are reaching out to them.

Now I yield to Ms. JENKINS.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is concerning to me, and I encourage a "yes" vote.

I would just like to highlight one provision because there has been a great deal of press lately about the misuse of government computers and the waste of time and taxpayer dollars by Federal employees at the Securities and Exchange Commission who are spending as much as 8 hours a day viewing pornography on government computers. However, this problem is not limited just to the SEC. The Inspector General at the National Science Foundation, which is authorized by this Act, found similar problems there. So what happened to these employees? According to the Inspector General, and I quote, NSF issued a formal proposal followed by a decision suspending them for 10 calendar days without pay. Ten days' suspension, unacceptable. Taxpayers deserve better.

This motion to recommit is simple. If you're a government employee, and you are disciplined for viewing, downloading, or e-mailing pornography, including child pornography, on government computers or during work hours, you will no longer be paid. You will be fired. If you think a couple of days of suspension, a reprimand, a transfer is the right response when someone uses government computers to spread pornography, then vote against this motion. But if you think spreading pornography with a government computer is an act that should lead to dismissal, then vote for this motion. I urge a vote for this motion.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I withdraw my point of order and rise in opposition to this motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, let me also take just a moment to thank the minority and majority members of the Science and Technology Committee for the many hours they've put in to making this bill a very good bipartisan bill. And also I want to thank the staff members who have put in even more hours to making this good bill.

Now let me take just a moment to tell you why this is an important and a good bipartisan bill. There are 6.5 billion people in the world. Half of those that are working make less than \$2 a day. Now, if we try to compete in a global economy on that type of labor, then you're going to see your kids and grandkids wind up with a national standard of living less than their parents. So we can't win in terms of wages. We have to win by having a higher technological base here.

In the last few years, you've seen that the public sector dollars have been stagnant in terms of our investment in research and development. And on the private sector level, they've actually gone down. Why does this matter? Because the rest of the world is increasing their investments in research and development, and the importance to us here in this country is that 50 percent of the growth in the GDP in our Nation since World War II has been a result of research and development. But we have to have more than just R&D. We have to have a workforce that can work at that higher level, and that's what this bill does also. There's a great STEM educational piece that will help not just Ph.D.s, but it will help those high school graduates, junior college graduates, and college graduates to work that higher level.

So what does all this mean? There's a cycle. The cycle is that you invest in R&D. R&D gives you innovation. Innovation gives you jobs, which creates the type of standard of living and revenue that allows us to reduce the deficit as well as to continue the R&D again.

Another important part of this bill is the energy independence. Right now we

have to reduce our dependence on our foreign oil for our economic as well as our national defense. And I don't want to trade our dependency on foreign oil to foreign technology.

Now let me get to some of the criticisms of this bill. We said, Well, it's a pretty good bill. As a matter of fact, it's a very good bill, except that it costs too much. Well, let me remind you that in 2007, 367 Members of this body voted for the original authorization. In the other body, there were 69 cosponsors of the original authorization, and it passed unanimously. But we recognize these are difficult economic times, and so we made some changes. This bill has been cut by 10.3 percent from the bill that you voted for in 2007. That is \$9.6 billion. Now tell me, what authorization has been cut by over 10 percent? This is the only one.

Mr. HALL has very good concerns about our veterans, and every day when we see him, we see him as an example of those World War II veterans. So language was put in the bill both for scholarships for individual veterans and also for those institutions. Let me read this to you. For the purposes of the activities and programs supported by this Act and the amendments made in this Act, institutions of higher education offering STEM research education offering activities and programs that serve veterans with disabilities shall receive special consideration and review. And on and on. So we have taken care of that.

Now let's get down to the heart of it. And quite frankly, it saddens me to have to go into this. I mean, it saddens me that when we look at our kids—I have a 9-year-old daughter, and what about her future? What about your family's future? Oh, we're going to hide behind this little bit. We're going to gut this bill for this little bit. A few days ago there were some NSF employees who were patching pornography. Of course that was bad, and they were disciplined. Throughout the whole executive offices, there is filtering on that now. Nobody seriously thinks that we don't want to deal with pornography here. For God's sake. And when it gets to the conference, we'll take care of that even more.

Everybody raise your hand that's for pornography. Come on, raise your hand. Nobody? Nobody is for pornography? Well, I'm shocked. So I guess we need this little bitty provision that means nothing; that's going to gut the entire bill. This is an embarrassment, and if you vote for this, you should be embarrassed.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds all Members not to traffic the well while another Member is under recognition. All Members will address their remarks to the Chair.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of H.R. 5116, if ordered, and motions to suspend the rules with regard to House Resolution 1338 and House Resolution 1337.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 292, noes 126, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 270]

## AYES—292

Aderholt	Davis (CA)	Kind
Adler (NJ)	Davis (KY)	King (IA)
Akin	Davis (TN)	King (NY)
Alexander	DeFazio	Kingston
Altmire	Dent	Kirk
Arcuri	Deutch	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Austria	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kissell
Baca	Diaz-Balart, M.	Klein (FL)
Bachmann	Dicks	Kline (MN)
Bachus	Doggett	Kosmas
Barrow	Donnelly (IN)	Kratovil
Bartlett	Dreier	Lamborn
Barton (TX)	Driehaus	Lance
Bean	Duncan	Langevin
Biggert	Edwards (TX)	Larsen (WA)
Bilbray	Ellsworth	Latham
Billirakis	Emerson	LaTourrette
Bishop (GA)	Etheridge	Latta
Bishop (NY)	Fallin	Lewis (CA)
Bishop (UT)	Fattah	Linder
Blackburn	Flake	Lipinski
Blunt	Fleming	LoBiondo
Boccheri	Forbes	Loeb sack
Boehner	Fortenberry	Lucas
Bonner	Foster	Luetkemeyer
Bono Mack	Fox	Lummis
Boozman	Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel E.
Boren	Frelinghuysen	Lynch
Boswell	Gallely	Mack
Boucher	Garamendi	Maffei
Boustany	Garrett (NJ)	Maloney
Boyd	Gerlach	Manzullo
Brady (PA)	Giffords	Marchant
Brady (TX)	Gingrey (GA)	Markley (CO)
Braley (IA)	Gohmert	Marshall
Bright	Goodlatte	Matheson
Broun (GA)	Granger	McCarthy (CA)
Brown (SC)	Graves	McCarthy (NY)
Brown-Waite,	Griffith	McCaul
Ginny	Guthrie	McClintock
Buchanan	Gutierrez	McCotter
Burgess	Hall (TX)	McHenry
Burton (IN)	Halvorson	McIntyre
Buyer	Hare	McKeon
Calvert	Harper	McMahon
Camp	Hastings (WA)	McMorris
Campbell	Heinrich	Rodgers
Cantor	Heller	McNerney
Cao	Hensarling	Meek (FL)
Capito	Hergert	Mica
Carnahan	Herseth Sandlin	Miller (FL)
Carney	Hill	Miller (MI)
Carter	Himes	Miller, Gary
Cassidy	Hinojosa	Minnick
Castle	Hodes	Mitchell
Chaffetz	Holden	Mollohan
Chandler	Hunter	Moore (KS)
Childers	Inglis	Moran (KS)
Coble	Israel	Murphy (NY)
Coffman (CO)	Issa	Murphy, Patrick
Conaway	Jenkins	Murphy, Tim
Connolly (VA)	Johnson (IL)	Myrick
Costa	Johnson, Sam	Neal (MA)
Costello	Jones	Neugebauer
Courtney	Jordan (OH)	Nunes
Crenshaw	Kagen	Nye
Crowley	Kanjorski	Olson
Cuellar	Kaptur	Owens
Culberson	Kildee	Pastor (AZ)
Dahlkemper	Kilroy	

Paul	Royce
Paulsen	Ruppersberger
Pence	Ryan (WI)
Perriello	Salazar
Peters	Sanchez, Loretta
Peterson	Scalise
Petri	Schauer
Pitts	Schiff
Platts	Schmidt
Poe (TX)	Schock
Pomeroy	Schrader
Posey	Schwartz
Price (GA)	Sensenbrenner
Putnam	Serrano
Radanovich	Sessions
Rahall	Sestak
Rehberg	Shadegg
Reichert	Shea-Porter
Richardson	Shimkus
Rodriguez	Shuler
Roe (TN)	Shuster
Rogers (AL)	Simpson
Rogers (KY)	Skelton
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NE)
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)
Rooney	Smith (TX)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (WA)
Roskam	Souder
Ross	Space

## NOES—126

Ackerman	Green, Gene	Ortiz
Andrews	Grijalva	Pallone
Baird	Hall (NY)	Pascarell
Baldwin	Harman	Payne
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Perlmuter
Berkley	Hinche	Pingree (ME)
Berman	Hirono	Polis (CO)
Berry	Holt	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Honda	Quigley
Brown, Corrine	Hoyer	Rangel
Butterfield	Inslee	Reyes
Capps	Jackson (IL)	Rothman (NJ)
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Cardoza	(TX)	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Sanchez, Linda T.
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Chu	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Clarke	Kilpatrick (MI)	Scott (GA)
Clay	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Clyburn	Lee (CA)	Sires
Cohen	Levin	Snyder
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Speier
Cooper	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark
Cummings	Lowey	Stupak
Davis (IL)	Lujan	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Markley (MA)	Thompson (MS)
Delahunt	Matsui	Tierney
DeLauro	McCollum	Towns
Dingell	McDermott	Tsongas
Edwards (MD)	McGovern	Van Hollen
Ehlers	Meeks (NY)	Velázquez
Ellison	Michaud	Wasserman
Engel	Miller (NC)	Schultz
Eshoo	Miller, George	Waters
Farr	Moore (WI)	Watson
Filner	Moran (VA)	Watt
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	Waxman
Fudge	Nadler (NY)	Welch
Gonzalez	Napolitano	Wilson (OH)
Gordon (TN)	Oberstar	Woolsey
Grayson	Obey	Yarmuth
Green, Al	Oliver	

## NOT VOTING—12

Barrett (SC)	Higgins	Rush
Cole	Hoekstra	Slaughter
Davis (AL)	Lee (NY)	Teague
Doyle	Melancon	Wamp

□ 1256

Messrs. LEVIN, COHEN, FARR, TOWNS, GEORGE MILLER of California and Ms. DELAULO changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. WEINER, BISHOP of New York, COSTA, SCHIFF, LARSEN of Washington, SMITH of Washington, ISRAEL, SERRANO, SESTAK, TANNER, KANJORSKI, MEEK of Florida, FATTAH, GUTIERREZ, BRALEY of Iowa, PETERSON of Minnesota, HEINRICH, KAGEN, PASTOR of Arizona, BOYD, CUELLAR, WALLZ, LYNCH, HILL, MATHESON, POM-

EROY, DEFAZIO, KILDEE, CHANDLER, NEAL, LIPINSKI, EDWARDS of Texas, HINOJOSA, COURTNEY, MURPHY of New York, ETHERIDGE, VISCLOSKEY, KIND, COSTELLO, RODRIGUEZ, CONNOLLY of Virginia, RUPPERSBERGER, WU, ARCURI, DEUTCH, GARAMENDI, BRADY of Pennsylvania, SPRATT, CARNAHAN, CROWLEY, LANGEVIN, TONKO, MOORE of Kansas, DICKS, BACA, HARE, LOEBSACK, SALAZAR, BISHOP of Georgia, DOGGETT, Mrs. HALVORSON, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. SUTTON, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Ms. BEAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further proceedings on H.R. 5116 are postponed.

## RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF AMERICAN CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1338, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1338.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 280, nays 128, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 271]

## YEAS—280

Ackerman	Brown, Corrine	Cummings
Aderholt	Buchanan	Dahlkemper
Adler (NJ)	Butterfield	Davis (CA)
Altmire	Cao	Davis (IL)
Andrews	Capito	Davis (TN)
Arcuri	Capps	DeFazio
Baca	Capuano	DeGette
Baird	Cardoza	Delahunt
Baldwin	Carnahan	DeLauro
Barrow	Carney	Dent
Barton (TX)	Carson (IN)	Deutch
Bean	Cassidy	Diaz-Balart, L.
Becerra	Castle	Diaz-Balart, M.
Berkley	Castor (FL)	Dicks
Berman	Chandler	Dingell
Berry	Childers	Doggett
Biggert	Chu	Donnelly (IN)
Bilbray	Clarke	Driehaus
Bishop (GA)	Clay	Edwards (MD)
Bishop (NY)	Cleaver	Edwards (TX)
Blumenauer	Clyburn	Ehlers
Boccheri	Cohen	Ellison
Boren	Connolly (VA)	Ellsworth
Boswell	Conyers	Engel
Boucher	Cooper	Eshoo
Boustany	Costa	Etheridge
Boyd	Costello	Farr
Brady (PA)	Courtney	Fattah
Bright	Crowley	Filner

Fortenberry Lofgren, Zoe  
 Foster Lowey  
 Frank (MA) Lucas  
 Frelinghuysen Luján  
 Fudge Lynch  
 Garamendi Maffei  
 Gerlach Maloney  
 Giffords Markey (CO)  
 Gonzalez Markey (MA)  
 Grayson Marshall  
 Green, Al Matheson  
 Green, Gene Matsui  
 Griffith McCarthy (NY)  
 Grijalva McCaul  
 Gutierrez McCollum  
 Hall (NY) McDermott  
 Hall (TX) McGovern  
 Halvorson McIntyre  
 Hare McMahon  
 Harman McNerney  
 Hastings (FL) Meek (FL)  
 Hastings (WA) Meeks (NY)  
 Heinrich Melancon  
 Herseht Sandlin Michaud  
 Hill Miller (NC)  
 Himes Miller, George  
 Hinchey Minnick  
 Hinojosa Mitchell  
 Hirono Mollohan  
 Holden Moore (WI)  
 Holt Moran (VA)  
 Honda Murphy (CT)  
 Hoyer Murphy (NY)  
 Inslee Murphy, Patrick  
 Israel Murphy, Tim  
 Jackson (IL) Napolitano  
 Jackson Lee Neal (MA)  
 (TX) Nye  
 Johnson (GA) Oberstar  
 Johnson, E. B. Obey  
 Kagen Oliver  
 Kanjorski Ortiz  
 Kaptur Owens  
 Kennedy Pallone  
 Kildee Pascrell  
 Kilpatrick (MI) Pastor (AZ)  
 Kilroy Paulsen  
 Kind Payne  
 Kirk Perlmutter  
 Kirkpatrick (AZ) Perriello  
 Kissell Peters  
 Klein (FL) Peterson  
 Kosmas Pingree (ME)  
 Kratovil Platts  
 Kucinich Polis (CO)  
 Lance Pomeroy  
 Langevin Price (NC)  
 Larsen (WA) Putnam  
 Larson (CT) Quigley  
 Latham Rahall  
 LaTourette Reyes  
 Lee (CA) Richardson  
 Levin Rodriguez  
 Lewis (GA) Rogers (AL)  
 Lipinski Rogers (KY)  
 Loeb sack Ros-Lehtinen

## NAYS—128

Akin Crenshaw  
 Alexander Culberson  
 Austria Davis (KY)  
 Bachmann Dreier  
 Bachus Duncan  
 Bartlett Emerson  
 Bilirakis Fallon  
 Bishop (UT) Flake  
 Blackburn Fleming  
 Blunt Forbes  
 Boehner Foxx  
 Bonner Franks (AZ)  
 Bono Mack Gallegly  
 Boozman Garrett (NJ)  
 Brady (TX) Gingrey (GA)  
 Broun (GA) Gohmert  
 Brown (SC) Goodlatte  
 Brown-Waite, Granger  
 Ginny Graves  
 Burgess Guthrie  
 Burton (IN) Harper  
 Buyer Heller  
 Calvert Hensarling  
 Camp Herger  
 Campbell Hunter  
 Cantor Inglis  
 Carter Issa  
 Chaffetz Jenkins  
 Coble Johnson (IL)  
 Coffman (CO) Johnson, Sam  
 Conaway Jones

Ross  
 Rothman (NJ)  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruppersberger  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schauer  
 Schiff  
 Schock  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (GA)  
 Scott (VA)  
 Serrano  
 Sestak  
 Shea-Porter  
 Sherman  
 Shuler  
 Sires  
 Skelton  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 Souder  
 Space  
 Speier  
 Spratt  
 Stark  
 Stupak  
 Sutton  
 Tanner  
 Taylor  
 Terry  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Tierney  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Towns  
 Tsongas  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walden  
 Walz  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Watson  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Welch  
 Whitfield  
 Wilson (OH)  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Yarmuth  
 Young (AK)

Nunes  
 Olson  
 Paul  
 Pence  
 Petri  
 Pitts  
 Poe (TX)  
 Posey  
 Price (GA)  
 Radanovich  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Roe (TN)

Barrett (SC)  
 Braley (IA)  
 Cole  
 Cuellar  
 Davis (AL)  
 Doyle  
 Gordon (TN)  
 Higgins

Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rooney  
 Roskam  
 Royce  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Scalise  
 Schmidt  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Shadegg  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster

## NOT VOTING—22

Hodes  
 Hoekstra  
 Lee (NY)  
 Moore (KS)  
 Nadler (NY)  
 Rangel  
 Rush  
 Salazar

Simpson  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Stearns  
 Sullivan  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiahrt  
 Tiberi  
 Westmoreland  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Young (FL)

Schakowsky  
 Schrader  
 Slaughter  
 Teague  
 Wamp  
 Waters

Conaway  
 Connolly (VA)  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Costello  
 Courtney  
 Crenshaw  
 Crowley  
 Culberson  
 Cummings  
 Dahlkemper  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (IL)  
 Davis (KY)  
 Davis (TN)  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delahunt  
 DeLauro  
 Dent  
 Deutch  
 Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Donnelly (IN)  
 Dreier  
 Driehaus  
 Duncan  
 Edwards (MD)  
 Edwards (TX)  
 Ehlers  
 Ellison  
 Ellsworth  
 Emerson  
 Engel  
 Etheridge  
 Fallin  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Filner  
 Flake  
 Fleming  
 Forbes  
 Fortenberry  
 Foster  
 Foxx  
 Frank (MA)  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Fudge  
 Gallegly  
 Garamendi  
 Garrett (NJ)  
 Gerlach  
 Gingrey (GA)  
 Gohmert  
 Gonzalez  
 Goodlatte  
 Gordon (TN)  
 Granger  
 Graves  
 Grayson  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Griffith  
 Grijalva  
 Guthrie  
 Gutierrez  
 Hall (NY)  
 Hall (TX)  
 Halvorson  
 Hare  
 Harman  
 Harper  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Heinrich  
 Heller  
 Hensarling  
 Herger  
 Herseth Sandlin  
 Hill  
 Himes  
 Hinchey  
 Hinojosa  
 Hirono  
 Holden  
 Holt  
 Honda  
 Hoyer  
 Hunter  
 Inglis  
 Inslee  
 Israel  
 Issa  
 Jackson (IL)

Jackson Lee  
 (TX)  
 Jenkins  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson (IL)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones  
 Jordan (OH)  
 Kagen  
 Kanjorski  
 Kaptur  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilpatrick (MI)  
 Kilroy  
 Kind  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kingston  
 Kirk  
 Kirkpatrick (AZ)  
 Kissell  
 Klein (FL)  
 Kline (MN)  
 Kosmas  
 Kratovil  
 Kucinich  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Latham  
 LaTourette  
 Latta  
 Lee (CA)  
 Levin  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Linder  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Loeb sack  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Lowey  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Luján  
 Lummis  
 Lungren, Daniel  
 E.  
 Lynch  
 Mack  
 Maffei  
 Maloney  
 Manzullo  
 Marchant  
 Markey (CO)  
 Markey (MA)  
 Marshall  
 Matheson  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (CA)  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McCollum  
 McCotter  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McHenry  
 McIntyre  
 McKeon  
 McMahon  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McNerney  
 Meek (FL)  
 Meeks (NY)  
 Melancon  
 Mica  
 Michaud  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller (NC)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Minnick  
 Mitchell  
 Mollohan  
 Moore (WI)  
 Moran (KS)  
 Moran (VA)  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Murphy (NY)  
 Murphy, Patrick  
 Murphy, Tim  
 Myrick

Napolitano  
 Neal (MA)  
 Neugebauer  
 Nunes  
 Nye  
 Oberstar  
 Obey  
 Olson  
 Oliver  
 Ortiz  
 Owens  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Pastor (AZ)  
 Paul  
 Paulsen  
 Payne  
 Pence  
 Perlmutter  
 Perriello  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Petri  
 Pingree (ME)  
 Pitts  
 Platts  
 Poe (TX)  
 Polis (CO)  
 Pomeroy  
 Price (GA)  
 Price (NC)  
 Putnam  
 Radanovich  
 Rahall  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Reyes  
 Richardson  
 Rodriguez  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rooney  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Rothman (NJ)  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Ruppersberger  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Scalise  
 Schauer  
 Schiff  
 Schmidt  
 Schock  
 Schrader  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (GA)  
 Scott (VA)  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sessions  
 Sestak  
 Shadegg  
 Shea-Porter  
 Sherman  
 Shimkus  
 Shuler  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Sires  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 Souder  
 Space  
 Speier  
 Spratt  
 Stark  
 Stearns  
 Sullivan  
 Sutton  
 Tanner  
 Taylor  
 Terry  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thompson (PA)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1304

Mr. FORTENBERRY changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## EXPRESSING SYMPATHY FOR FLOOD VICTIMS IN SOUTHEAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1337, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1337.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 272]

## YEAS—402

Ackerman  
 Adierholt  
 Adler (NJ)  
 Akin  
 Alexander  
 Altmire  
 Andrews  
 Arcuri  
 Austria  
 Baca  
 Bachmann  
 Bachus  
 Baird  
 Baldwin  
 Barrow  
 Bartlett  
 Barton (TX)  
 Bean  
 Becerra  
 Berkley  
 Berry  
 Biggert  
 Bilbray  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Blackburn  
 Blumenauer  
 Blunt  
 Boccieri  
 Boehner  
 Bonner  
 Bono Mack  
 Boozman  
 Boren  
 Boswell  
 Boucher  
 Boustany  
 Boyd  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brady (TX)  
 Bright  
 Brown (GA)  
 Brown (SC)  
 Brown, Corrine  
 Brown-Waite,  
 Buchanan  
 Burgess  
 Burton (IN)  
 Butterfield  
 Buyer  
 Calvert  
 Camp  
 Campbell  
 Cantor  
 Cardoza  
 Carnahan  
 Carney  
 Carson (IN)  
 Carter  
 Cassidy  
 Castle  
 Castor (FL)  
 Chaffetz  
 Chandler  
 Childers  
 Chu  
 Clarke  
 Clay  
 Coble  
 Coffman (CO)  
 Cohen

Thornberry	Visclosky	Westmoreland
Tiahrt	Walden	Whitfield
Tiberi	Walz	Wilson (OH)
Titus	Wasserman	Wilson (SC)
Tonko	Schultz	Wittman
Towns	Waters	Wolf
Tsongas	Watson	Woolsey
Turner	Watt	Wu
Upton	Waxman	Yarmuth
Van Hollen	Weiner	Young (AK)
Velázquez	Welch	Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—28

Barrett (SC)	Giffords	Rush
Berman	Higgins	Salazar
Braley (IA)	Hodes	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Hoekstra	Skelton
Clyburn	Lee (NY)	Slaughter
Cole	Moore (KS)	Teague
Cuellar	Nadler (NY)	Tierney
Davis (AL)	Possey	Wamp
Doyle	Quigley	
Eshoo	Rangel	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KISSELL) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1311

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I regret missing floor votes on Thursday, May 13, 2010. If I were present, I would have voted: "Yea" on rollcall 271, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree to H. Res. 1338—Recognizing the significant accomplishments of AmeriCorps; "yea" on rollcall 272, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree to H. Res. 1337—Expressing the sympathy and condolences of the House of Representatives to those people affected by the flooding in Tennessee, Kentucky, and Mississippi in May, 2010.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on official business and missed rollcall vote Nos. 267, 268, 269, 270, 271 and 272. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote Nos. 267, 268, 269, 271, and 272 and would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote No. 270.

## APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO HIT POLICY COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 13101 of the HITECH Act (P.L. 111-5), and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment of the following member to the HIT Policy Committee for a term of 3 years:

Mr. Paul Egerman, Weston, Massachusetts.

□ 1315

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. CANTOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purpose of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, Mr. Speaker, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of suspensions will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we will consider Senate amendments to H.R. 4213, the American Jobs Closing Tax Loopholes and Preventing Outsourcing Act.

I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, given the fact that he has announced only one rule bill for next week, I would ask the gentleman if he expects the House to be in session next Friday, and I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to tell the gentleman, although I announced only the American Jobs Bill Closing Tax Loopholes and Preventing Outsourcing Act, my expectation is we will also deal with the COMPETES Act next week as well. That bill, we believe, is a very important bill. We think it's very important for jobs. We think it's very important for investing in our future, and we intend to bring that bill to the floor as well next week.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the gentleman's announcement about next week's floor schedule, I'd also like to announce an additional item that we Republicans would like to see and will bring up for a vote on the House floor next week.

Yesterday, House Republicans announced an unprecedented online effort called YouCut, and this can be found at [republicanwhip.house.gov/YouCut](http://republicanwhip.house.gov/YouCut). This program allows the public to vote on wasteful programs they'd like to see the House cut. Over 70,000 Americans have thus far voted in the program called YouCut.

I'd say, Mr. Speaker, we will announce the public's choice this coming Monday and then provide for debate on the cut of their choosing during our first rule bill of the week, which, as the gentleman has indicated, is the tax extenders.

And, Mr. Speaker, therefore I would say to the Members that in addition to the majority leader's announced schedule, there will also be a vote on the consideration of one of five possible savings proposals.

The first is to eliminate the Presidential Election Fund, and that would amount to a \$260 million saving. The

next could be the elimination of the taxpayers' subsidized union activities, a \$600 million savings to the taxpayer. Next could be the elimination of a HUD program that funds doctoral dissertations. That is a \$1 million tax savings for the taxpayers. Also, we could see the people of this country vote for the elimination of new nonreform welfare programs that could save the public \$3.5 billion. Also, Mr. Speaker, among the items that the American public is opining on right now online is a proposal to eliminate wealthy communities from the CDBG program. That would offer a \$2.6 billion savings to the taxpayers.

So I'd say, Mr. Speaker, we on the Republican side of the aisle, as I have told the gentleman before, stand ready to work with the majority in hopes of trying to encourage legislation that would reflect these cuts, encourage the majority to bring those to the floor. But having not received any bit of cooperation or at least recognition that we need to do something like that, we intend to bring those votes forward on these items and whichever items the American people vote on first to the floor next week.

Mr. Speaker, moving on to the gentleman's announced schedule. I notice that the majority leader did not indicate whether we would consider a budget next week. It's now been 4 weeks since the April 15 deadline for completing a budget, and I'd ask the gentleman, does he still think that the House will consider a budget prior to Memorial Day, as he stated before?

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I am certainly hopeful that we will deal with the issue of spending levels by the time we bring appropriation bills to the floor. We are working on that.

I will say to my friend who has just given us an exposition on his new program—and he gave the Web site address, I think—that, first of all, let me say that we welcome the interest in the Republican Party in cutting spending. Of course, spending was substantially increased when you had the Presidency and the House and the Senate, very substantially, as you know, at twice the rate it was increased during the Clinton administration. We also believe that we are sure that many citizens have some very useful suggestions.

I would also urge them to make their suggestions to the commission which the President has appointed to get a handle on not 16/100 of spending but on the real dollars that confront us and which the American public are very concerned about.

The commission that the President appointed is to look at how we can bring spending down, how we can address the deficit, and how we can get back to the place where we were at the end of 2000, at the end of the Clinton

administration when we had a \$5.6 trillion surplus. Unfortunately, that surplus was turned into this administration inheriting about a \$5 trillion deficit while your party was in total control of the House, the Senate, and the administration.

But we certainly look forward to the suggestions that you have or anybody has in the public as to how we can bring spending under control.

Your party has talked a lot about earmarks. As the gentleman well knows, in 1994 there were some 4,000 earmarks between our 50 States and 435 districts. That was escalated under Republicans to 15,000—quadrupled the number of earmarks. Now the gentleman is against earmarks, at least wants a suspension of those. We think that that is, perhaps, progress.

But I want to tell the gentleman that we hope you will cooperate with us in the findings of the commission. You have three very outstanding Members that have been appointed from this House. Hopefully they will make substantive suggestions to get the budget deficit under control as was done in the 1990s when, for the first time in your lifetime and in mine—and I have a lot more lifetime to tout than you do—we had a balanced budget for 4 years in a row. That's never happened in your lifetime or in mine other than during the Clinton administration. That was important.

Unfortunately, in the following decade that we have just been through, again the deficit was exploded. But certainly any efforts to get suggestions from anybody, including the American public, of how they think that we can reduce spending, bring the deficit under control, is welcome, and we look forward to hearing suggestions.

But I want to say that while some of the programs you have mentioned, I have one of those programs being a \$200,000 program. You say it's a \$1 million program. In either event, it's certainly worth looking at to see whether it has value to invest dollars in.

But you and I both know that in a \$3.56 trillion budget deficit that we have to look at the big numbers where we're spending money and what policies we have adopted in order to get to where I think all of us want to be, and that's back to where we were in fiscal year 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000.

I yield.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for his sentiments.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that first of all, if we can't start here and instead have to wait until after the upcoming election, what does that say to the American people?

I also have noted that the gentleman has issued statements about the relative size of the proposed options online under the YouCut program. And nowhere else, nowhere else but Washington could these cuts be deemed to not be significant. Just because they are less than 1 percent of the Federal budget doesn't mean we ought not at

least start there rather than kick the can down the road like Washington has under both parties' leadership. And the gentleman knows I am the first to admit that our party was fired in 2006 much on account of the runaway spending. But we have an opportunity to work together to actually begin some progress rather than continue to say let's shift the responsibility outside to a commission that the President has created.

The facts are, Mr. Speaker, we've considered 63 resolutions naming post offices this year, 62 resolutions congratulating sports teams, and we've even supported the designation of Pi Day. Yet you don't think, and I really can't imagine why, we wouldn't have time to debate proposals regarding the types of savings that I enumerated.

And that's why, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, if he doesn't want to engage in the votes that we are going to present next week, why can't we have a bill brought to the floor with these measures? He and I can sit here and debate in a colloquy, but I think the American people would like to see the House actually engage in these debates.

So I, again, appreciate the gentleman's indication that he wants to work with us, but time and again we see ourselves here on this House floor taking up resolutions naming post offices instead of trying to do the people's business, emphasizing their priority, which is let's do something to cut the debt that is being imposed on our kids and their kids once and for all.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. We've done some very substantive things, most of which your party has opposed. We passed last year the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act which you voted against and which your party voted, to a person, against. I don't know whether you happened to see that, as a result of that act, people last year paid the lowest tax rates that they have paid since 1950. We reduced over \$300 billion in taxes for individuals and small business.

Now, you can make fun of the resolutions that your party introduces and my party congratulating people for things or noting that post offices are being renamed or things of that nature, but that's a ruse. That's not the substance of what we do here. Members want to acknowledge their hometown folks. I've been in the legislature for a long period of time. They did that in the State senate. They do it here. And sometimes it's easy to make fun of.

But we've done some very substantive things. The gentleman knows that. This is one of the most productive Congresses that I've served in over the last 30 years in terms of very important pieces of legislation. Your party has voted, in many instances, against that legislation.

The proof of the pudding, of course, is in its eating. You didn't ask me where

the jobs are this time as you usually do. There were 290,000 new jobs created, 230,000 jobs the month before that, and an average of 100,000 jobs have been created per month over the last 4 months.

The gentleman, over the last 4 months, hasn't mentioned jobs, apparently because he thinks perhaps we found them where, frankly, the previous administration lost them wherever they were lost. We need to bring them back.

We are investing in bills to get jobs back. We're investing in making sure that people who have lost their jobs have some sustenance to support themselves and their families. We don't think that's de minimis legislation. We think it's critically important.

□ 1330

We are passing legislation to make sure that people have health care; that when they lose their job, they lose their insurance, they get sick, that they have a COBRA coverage that they can count on. We don't think that is de minimis. We are working on legislation to make sure that doctors get reimbursed at appropriate levels so they will continue to serve the seniors of America under Medicare. We don't think that is de minimis action.

Now, I could go on and on, as I am sure you know and probably my colleagues know; but we believe we are passing a lot of legislation to respond to a deep crisis of economic depths, unknown since 75 years ago in the Great Depression, that we inherited and we are trying to respond to. And we are now creating jobs. We are now expanding the economy.

Somebody that you may agree with most of the time, Larry Kudlow, said, you ought to stop talking down the economy. The facts speak for themselves. GDP growth for three quarters in a row, jobs being created, stock market up. It has been down and up in little glitches, but it is up some 70 percent on the Dow, 80 percent on the S&P, and almost 100 percent on the NASDAQ. None of that we think is de minimis, I tell my friend.

Both sides, by the way, do what you just did. We did it to you and we made fun of these little resolutions that don't take much time but are meaningful to the constituencies that hear about them and appreciate the fact that their efforts throughout the country were acknowledged in one way or another, or that somebody that has great respect in their community was honored. Many soldiers and sailors and airmen and marines are being honored by having post offices named for them in their communities. Others are being honored.

So I tell my friend, we need to be serious. We have a critical deficit confronting us. We have a critical long-term deficit confronting us. We have a critical problem of an unsustainable entitlement regime confronting us. The Peterson Institute is running hearings

all over this country to say, Americans, tell us what you think. I don't think your idea is a bad idea of asking Americans. We all want to ask Americans: What do you think? So we can come together to solve what we both agree is a very serious economic ditch into which we have fallen. We need to get out of it. We need to work together to do that. The American public expects us to do that.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would say, first of all, I think the gentleman knows I have never, never rooted against this economy or this country. In fact, I have gone out of my way to make public statements when we have positive job growth to say, when we see jobs growing, it is a good thing. Period. I have been consistent in that message.

So I just wanted to speak to that and correct the gentleman's assertion that somehow I am not giving credit for job growth. But I would say we do have much work to be done.

He indicates that somehow this last year was a year that Americans paid lower taxes than ever before in recent memory. I would say they paid lower taxes because we have a progressive tax system; and the fact that the recession reduced income by over \$200 billion last year versus 2008. That is the reality. If you want to get serious, that is the reality. Not some fantasy that we have somehow lowered tax rates, when we know good and well at the end of this year tax rates are expected to skyrocket again on top of what we have just done with the new entitlement bill and the health care bill.

So I would say to the gentleman, I am not questioning his intentions. I am not saying that there haven't been substantive proposals brought to the floor. I am saying there have been a disproportionate number of times we have been on the floor doing things that we could have been spending time on others to do more productive things for the people of this country.

I agree; the gentleman says we are at a crossroads. Yes, we are. The problem is, the substance and the policy proposals that the gentleman and his party have been bringing to the floor over the last year and a half have serious consequences, and they are aggravating the future prospects for growth in this country.

He just indicated, Mr. Speaker, that entitlements, if we don't get a handle on entitlements, we could see our standard of living go down. Well, you are absolutely right. The gentleman is correct on that. But what did we just pass a few months ago? The largest entitlement ever.

So, again, we can say things and we can have good intentions; but when they are matched with the deeds, something just doesn't add up.

And I would say, Mr. Speaker, the issue is about spending. It is about the debt we are amassing. So when the gentleman points out that they have brought to the floor the stimulus bill

of 800-some billion dollars, that has proven not to be a good, quote-unquote, investment and in fact has now saddled our kids and their kids with even more debt, and sent a signal to the global investment community that America may have trouble paying its bills.

That is why we are intent on trying to bring forward the You Cut proposals to begin changing the culture here in this town, in this body, to begin to save taxpayer dollars, not with an emphasis on spending.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Maybe the public gets tired of this back and forth. But the gentleman talks in ways that indicate that all of a sudden, in 2009, January, when President Obama took office, somehow the world fell apart. In point of fact, as the gentleman knows, in the last year of the Clinton administration, we gained 1.9 million new jobs. In the last year of the Bush administration, under the policies that the gentleman supported and his party was very enthusiastic about, we lost 3.8 million jobs. That is a 5.7 million job turnaround.

Yes, we were in dire straits. And conservative economists, Republican economists, Mr. Zandi and others, as well as progressive economists, liberal economists, call them what you will, all said: If you do not invest in this economy, if you do not invest in stabilizing this economy, very frankly, you are going to lose 800,000 in additional revenues. Which meant that you would be in the same debt position whether you invested that money or didn't.

Now, in investing that money, I say to my friend, with all but maybe 2 months over the last 15 months we have had a straight line out of the almost 800,000 jobs that under your policies were lost in the last month of the Bush administration. Almost 800,000 jobs. We have been on a straight line to now where 5 of the last 6 months, we have had positive job growth.

Is it enough? It is not. Should we do more? We should. Should we cooperate in doing that? Absolutely. That is what the American public expects us to do. But don't forget the fact of how we got here. Don't forget the fact that an awful lot of economists on your other side of the aisle said we needed to invest or the economy was going to fall even further, and we wouldn't have that straight line out of the depths of loss of jobs into the positive numbers of creating jobs.

Let me also say to you, you mentioned taxes, and you mentioned the fact that somehow it was because incomes fell. Incomes did fall, and that was unfortunate. They fell because, we believe—we don't agree on this—it was because of the economic policies that were pursued. We think our facts are valid.

I would remind you, 216,000 jobs per month for 96 months under the Clinton administration, average, 216,000; 21

months of over 400,000 jobs. The Bush administration had 5 of those months, and the Bush administration's average job creation over 96 months was 11,000 jobs; 216,000 versus 11,000 jobs.

So the economy was in great distress. Yes, we had to invest. Yes, we had to borrow. Because, if we didn't, our grandchildren—and I have grandchildren. I have a great grandchild. I am very worried about what they are going to inherit, and I knew that we could not allow the economy to fall through the floor.

But let me say this. This is from USA Today, from an article that appeared: Taxes Paid Have Fallen Much Faster Than Income in This Recession. Your proposition was taxes fell because income fell. Personal income fell 2 percent last year. That is 2 percent too much. Actually, it is about 10 percent too much, because we would have hoped they would have gone up 5 percent or 6 percent or 7 percent.

But listen to this next sentence. I know you will want to get this next sentence: "Taxes paid dropped 23 percent. The BEA classified Social Security taxes as insurance payments."

So I tell my friend, we inherited a terrible economy from the Bush administration, and we have been working very hard to bring it back. And almost every indication indicates that in fact it is coming back. We invested in trying to keep the automobile companies employing people, and they are doing that.

So I tell my friend that I did not, as you recall, imply that you had talked down the economy. What I said was Larry Kudlow, talking to his fellow conservatives, said, Don't do it, because the facts don't warrant that kind of attack.

So we are going to continue to work. I want to work with you. We want to get this economy moving. We want to create jobs. You will have legislation on the floor next week, hopefully you will work with us, that we think will do that. It will create summer jobs. It will invest in infrastructure with the America Bonds program. So there are a number of things that you will have an opportunity to vote on next week, I hope you will join us, which are going to continue to stabilize those who don't have jobs and to create jobs for them in the new economy.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. And I know that the gentleman knows, having quoted the article that he did, in that same article the writer gives a lot of credit to the impact of the so-called Bush tax cuts as being economically generative, causing some of the positive results.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will just yield on that, are you referring to the paragraph that says: "Presidents Clinton and Bush pushed through a series of tax changes, credits, lower rates, higher exemptions that slashed income taxes for poor and middle-class families"?

Mr. CANTOR. That is correct, I would say to the gentleman. I am referring to that.

And so while we are on that subject, we know very well there has been no indication whatsoever that the ability for entrepreneurs to continue to experience an atmosphere that is conducive to their investment and assumption of risk will continue, because we are facing the largest tax hike in American history at the end of this year and the majority has been unwilling to say that is not coming. That is hanging over this economy as a veil of uncertainty.

And I would say to the gentleman, if he is so excited about the positive results that he indicates, largely due to the fiscal policies in place that will be not in place after the end of this year, I would say that maybe we should consider extending the rate cuts and cap gains and dividends and marginal rate reductions that are in place now.

I would also say to the gentleman, listen, we have been now for weeks and months through this: Your fault, our fault. Your fault, our fault. The public and the American people are upset. They don't want blame games anymore; they want to stop the spending. And just next week, the gentleman is talking again about bringing more spending. He indicates that all economists supported the stimulus bill. He knows that is not true. But, like a good lawyer, he is going to present his case. But what I would say to the gentleman, let's stop the spending now.

That is why we have started and launched the You Cut program. And, if he alleges incremental modest steps, fine. Join us in that. But let's stop the spending, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. I don't want to get too personal on this, but what do you think about cutting the spending for the high-speed rail between Richmond and Washington?

Mr. CANTOR. Well, I would say to the gentleman, I have always, way before we have even encountered that stimulus bill, supported job-generating projects. The studies in the metropolitan area from which I come and represent indicate that Virginia could grow 165,000 jobs with that kind of investment.

Mr. HOYER. Is that a "no"?

Mr. CANTOR. That has always been my position.

But when we are looking at some of the items that we are discussing here on the You Cut options, these are items that are niceties. They may be well-intentioned; but if we are worried about job creation and we are worried about deficits growing, we ought to begin to take action now.

I would ask the gentleman, he mentioned the tax extenders bill for next week, and I wonder if he could tell us the content of that bill. Will there be a markup on the bill? Reports have indicated, and perhaps the gentleman has said, that the bill will be nearly \$200 billion. And what kind of rule, whether it be open or not, would he expect?

Mr. HOYER. I don't think I mentioned a figure on the extenders. I am pretty sure I did not, not today or, frankly, any other day, because it hasn't been finally completed by the Ways and Means Committee. As you know, they are working with the Senate Finance Committee as well, and working with Republicans. As you know, this was a bipartisan bill when it came from the Senate, Republicans supported it, and we hope it is a bipartisan bill as it leaves here.

But let me say the fact is what the Senate sent us, we are working on. The process that we will consider it has not yet been finally determined, so I can't tell the gentleman exactly what that will be. But some of the things I have already mentioned will be in it, UI and COBRA, FMAP, Build America Bonds for local infrastructure programs, summer jobs programs so we can get young people to work this summer so that they will have some livelihood and can help their families who are in distress.

□ 1345

We also, as I said, are going to deal with the SGR to ensure seniors can keep their doctors. We'll conclude provisions to close tax loopholes, crack down on outsourcing of jobs overseas and protect American jobs here at home. Those are all the things that I think will be in it. That's not necessarily an exclusive list, but that is certainly a bill that we think will be pro-business, and confirming many of the tax benefits that are given to businesses, as you well know, that we regulate, continue, including the investment tax credit so that we can encourage businesses to grow and invest and to create jobs.

So that is an outline of it. This process has not yet been decided. I'm sure there will be discussions about that tomorrow with our Rules Committee chair and with the committee. Perhaps we can know at a later date.

Mr. CANTOR. Again, just to clarify, Mr. Speaker, does that mean that the bill will not go through committee?

Mr. HOYER. I think, as you know, there was a bill over from the Senate, which was bipartisan in nature, and I think that we need to move this bill before Memorial Day. I think that the committee is going to have to decide how to get that done in the fastest way possible so that many of the expiring issues do not expire, which would be very detrimental to docs and to many other people.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman and I have been working together for some months now on the Iran sanctions bill. And also crucial to the national security of this country is the war supplemental. He has indicated before that the Iran sanctions conference report and the war supplemental will be coming to the House floor prior to the Memorial Day recess. I'd ask whether that still is the case.

Mr. HOYER. I'm sure everybody listening now will be glad to hear that

there is some cooperation and agreement. The gentleman and I are both strong supporters of the Iran sanction legislation. We believe that not only is the Middle East region at risk, but the international community is at risk as long as Iran is pursuing its intent to arm itself with nuclear weapons.

I tell the gentleman that I have been working very closely with Mr. BERMAN, and it is my hope and expectation that this conference report will be reported back to us before the Memorial Day break, and it is my intention to work towards having that sent to the President before we leave here for the Memorial Day break.

Mr. CANTOR. And I would ask, Mr. Speaker, would the same be for the supplemental as well—before the Memorial Day recess?

Mr. HOYER. I don't think the same would be because of both the Senate and the House. I'm hopeful that we will pass the supplemental through the House, but it won't be in the same position because we haven't had a conference on the supplemental. The Senate is working on a bill, as the gentleman knows. We're working on a bill. I have talked to the chairman, and he is trying to get the matter together for the committee. And I am hopeful that we will pass it through the House. My urging is that we pass it through the House prior to the Memorial Day break. But, obviously, the gentleman knows we will not have effected a conference by that time. But we want to do so very shortly because, clearly, we need to make sure the resources are available for our men and women in harm's way in both Iraq and Afghanistan and in other troubled spots of the world.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman in a fiscally responsible manner, which starts with passing a budget blueprint for this year, just like American families have to do.

I thank the gentleman once again for his time, and I yield back.

**AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON THURSDAY, MAY 20, 2010, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HIS EXCELLENCY FELIPE CALDERON HINOJOSA, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES**

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Thursday, May 20, 2010, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Excellency Felipe Calderon Hinojosa, President of the United Mexican States.

The Speaker pro Tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.



# 

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 18, 2010, for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

## 

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of William "Bill" Elkins, Jr., who was born January 20, 1920, to William and Virginia Elkins. He, sadly, passed way on May 12 of this year.

Mr. Elkins was born and raised in Los Angeles, California, where he was known for his civility, loyalty, discretion, diplomacy, and dedication to civil rights. He was the right-hand man of the late Mayor Tom Bradley for 40 years—before, during, and after the mayor's four times in office—as the first African American to hold that high post and as the elected official who held it the longest to date.

Mr. Elkins met the future mayor while they attended Lafayette Middle School in South Los Angeles. Their friendship strengthened in subsequent years of study in college and work for the City of Los Angeles.

A graduate of Jefferson High School, young Bill Elkins left college to serve his country by enlisting in the Army and was assigned for 4 years to Italy during World War II. He returned to earn his bachelor's degree in political science at UCLA, where he and Tom Bradley pledged Kappa Alpha Psi fraternity together. He worked for the county as a probation officer and earned his juris doctorate from Southwestern University Law School, once again taking classes with LAPD Officer Tom Bradley, who was the best man at his wedding in 1945.

He then became the director of Teen Post. It was an inner-city after-school youth program. He rose to be the general counsel right next to our mayor, Tom Bradley.

He became the Mayor's point-man on affirmative action and was more responsible than any other single individual for remedying the exclusion of people of color and women from employment in responsible positions for the City of Los Angeles. He was also Mayor Bradley's liaison to Washington, DC, and was responsible for several citywide programs, including the city's Area Agency for Aging and multiple youth programs.

After Mayor Bradley left office, Elkins served on the board of the Thomas Spiegel Family Foundation as that philanthropy's vice president, until he retired a few years ago. Elkins

was also a member of Second Baptist Church for more than 70 years.

Mr. Elkins leaves to cherish his memory his wife Eleanor, to whom he was married for 65 years, their sons Bill and Larry, two grandchildren, and a host of family, friends and colleagues.

We honor Mr. Elkins today—a good and decent American whose deeds in life and record of public service deserve to be acknowledged and commemorated.

May God rest his soul.

## 

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the majority leader—the Democrat majority leader's comments about the accomplishments that have been made by this Congress. I would just like to say briefly this: the American people don't want to hear this hyperbole. They don't want to hear these long dissertations about what's being accomplished around here. What the American people want is to cut spending and to get this economy moving again and create jobs. And blowing money like the Democrats are doing and creating a debt that our kids will never be able to deal with is not the answer.

And so I'd like the next time that they have this discussion back and forth for 45 minutes that they cut to the chase and say, We're going to do this to cut spending. We're going to do this to create jobs. And we're going to cut taxes like Ronald Reagan did to get this economy moving again, instead of all this other stuff that's going on.

## 

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor today to congratulate Palestinian Authority Chairman Mahmoud Abbas and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu on their decision to start proximity talks. I believe the United States' national security interest is directly linked to the resolution of this long-standing conflict. I also believe that, like other seemingly intractable conflicts, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can be resolved, especially with the active and even-handed leadership of the United States. Congratulations to President Obama and Envoy Mitchell, who got right to work on Middle East peace right after the President's inauguration and, despite huge hurdles, have both been persistent.

I hope the President continues to encourage all parties to negotiate seriously and in good faith and to move from proximity talks to direct negotiations to reach agreement on final and

permanent status issues. The world needs a secure Israel and it needs an independent, viable Palestinian state. However, simply declaring support for one side or the other does not really help either side. Both sides benefit from peace. We need to build a constituency for peace, and that means support for each side to make the necessary concessions.

## 

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the new Supreme Court pick, Elena Kagan, has never been a judge. News reports say she doesn't have trial court experience as a lawyer. As a lawyer, she never questioned a witness or made an argument before a jury. She's never been a trial judge so she never had to make a constitutional ruling in the courtroom in the heat of trial. She's never heard a civil case. She's never heard a criminal case. She's never even heard a traffic case. She's never ruled on the rules of evidence like the exclusionary rule. She's never instructed a jury on reasonable doubt or sentenced a convicted criminal.

Why should Elena Kagan be confirmed to a lifetime appointment to the most powerful court in the world? She'd be judging trial lawyers and trial judges who've been through the mud and the blood and the beer of courtroom trials. A trial—maybe something she's never even seen. She's an academic elitist that's never tried a case. That's like putting someone in charge of the brain surgery unit that's never done an operation.

And that's just the way it is.

## 

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, philately, or stamp collecting, is a hobby that teaches history, art, geography, and even heraldry. As stamps have branched out into film and iconic figures, there seems to be no limit to the subjects they cover, from Elvis to dinosaurs to Laurel and Hardy.

I rise today to honor Stamp Camp USA as it celebrates its 15th year in Elkland, Pennsylvania. The camp is the brainchild of Cheryl Edgcomb, who is the local postmaster in Nelson, Pennsylvania. Her camp introduces stamp collecting from basics, like sorting and handling, up to beginning exhibiting using both creative 3-dimensional and traditional formats.

As the children learn, they earn "stamp camp cash," which they use to purchase supplies for their hobby. There is a whole network of supporters of the camp, including 4-H, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, YMCA, YWCA, public libraries, Experience Works, AmeriCorps

VISTA, Head Start, and others. Stamp Camp USA has expanded to other regions of the country.

This month, we celebrate the 15th anniversary of the camp in an attempt to break a new Guinness world record for the largest evident collection of rainbows on stamps. We wish them luck in the competition and continued success in teaching children to love collecting stamps.

□ 1400

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Police Week. In 1962, President John F. Kennedy signed a Presidential proclamation that set aside May 15 as National Peace Officers Memorial Day, and the week of May 15 as National Police Week. Since that time, we have dedicated this week to honor those who have fallen in the line of duty.

During this week, police officers and their families and people in our communities throughout the country come together to honor and remember those officers who have fallen in the line of duty. It's a week to honor their service, their sacrifice, and their life. But this week is also for the surviving family members and fellow officers of the fallen. It's a time of tribute, and it's a time of healing.

Northeast Ohio has experienced the tragic loss of two police officers recently this year. At the end of his watch on March 15, 2010, Officer James Kerstetter of the Elyria Police Department was shot and killed in the line of duty. Just 2 days earlier, on March 13, Officer Thomas Patton of the Cleveland Heights Police Department collapsed and died while in pursuit of a suspect. Officers Kerstetter and Patton gave their lives in protection of their communities. These brave men knew the risks of the profession, but they also knew the rewards. Our policemen and women are part of the foundation of our communities. They risk it all as they walk the beat and patrol the streets, keeping our families and neighborhoods safe. Police officers go to work every day, committed to the oath that they take to serve and protect. And too often when officers fall, we are reminded of the costs and the sacrifice of the protection they provide us.

But we must not only remember their service in times of loss. We must not only appreciate all that they do for

us during this 1 week. We must appreciate their service and support them every week, every day. We must commit ourselves to the mission of supporting the service of our police and giving them the means to fulfill their oath. That's why this year and in previous years, I supported full funding to the Community Oriented Policing Services, known as the COPS program. Congress created COPS in the 1990s to address increasing crime rates, and it has succeeded in putting over 117,000 more police on the beat. COPS' funding had been cut significantly after the 1990s, but I am proud to say that I have fought to make sure that this funding is continually improved and restored.

The Recovery Act that was passed and was supported by the FOP provided \$1 billion for this competitive grant, aiding police forces that were facing drastic cuts in the face of a declining economy. There were 165 officers' jobs saved throughout Ohio, and in my district alone 30 officers' positions were saved through COPS funding by the Recovery Act, and that doesn't even take into account all of us who were saved and safer because they were on the street.

We must continue to fight for funding and support our police, just as they fight for us every day to keep us safe, just as Officer Kerstetter and Officer Patton fought to keep us safe and gave their lives to protect us, let us always be there for them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUJÁN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### HONORING CORPORAL HARVEY DURING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, National Police Week provides an opportunity for all of us to reflect on our law enforcement officers' countless contributions to building safe communities, not only in the Nation but also in the 19th Congressional District. This week, we pay tribute to those police officers who sacrifice so much for our safety. I am honored to stand behind those who risk their lives on a daily basis to keep our families and our neighborhoods safe. During this week, we also take time to remember those officers who we have lost in the line of duty and their families.

This week, members of the Lubbock County Sheriff's Office are in Washington to attend the candlelight vigil in honor of fallen police officers across the Nation, including Lubbock County Sheriff Deputy Corporal Harvey. Cor-

poral Harvey was killed on April 6, 2009, in a vehicle accident while on duty. Corporal Harvey joined the Lubbock County Sheriff's Office in 2001 and was a member of the Texas Tactical Peace Officers Association. Corporal Harvey was a devoted father to sons J.D. and Austin and loving husband to his wife, Stacy.

Corporal Harvey's name will be engraved on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial and will be revealed during a ceremony in honor of all 116 officers who were killed in 2009. I will have the great honor to meet Corporal Harvey's parents, Danny and Diana, and his brother Brendan while they are here in Washington and to welcome the Lubbock County Sheriff's Department Honor Guard. We cannot and will not forget the service of Corporal Harvey and the many others who have lost their lives in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, we sometimes take for granted that every day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, that men and women go out and put on a different uniform than our Nation's military. They put on a uniform of keeping the peace in our country, keeping our homes safe, keeping our businesses safe, keeping our streets safe. And we thank those men and women that do that. Sometimes I think we take them for granted.

I hope that the American people will use this week to go up to a peace officer, a law enforcement officer and take that opportunity to say "thank you." But also, maybe you live in a neighborhood where a sheriff's officer or a police officer lives in your neighborhood. Maybe they live next door to you. I hope you will take time to say to their family, Thank you for supporting your dad or your mom or your husband or your wife and allowing them to serve our country in this very special way because truly, it is a team sport, because without the support of the families, these men and women could not go and do the great job that we ask them to do. And what we learn is, this is a dangerous job, and unfortunately every year, we lose officers in the line of duty. We've already lost at least one in the 19th Congressional District this year. So from all the people in the 19th Congressional District—and I think I can speak for all the people across America, thank you, peace officers, law enforcement officers all across our country. And may God bless you, and may He continue to bless the United States of America.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 76

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as cosponsor of H.J. Res. 76.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### REMEMBERING LENA HORNE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATSON. Today I would like to acknowledge the loss of one of Hollywood's brightest stars, the legendary Lena Horne. Lena Horne broke barriers as a performer. She began her career at age 16, making a name for herself as a dancer in Harlem's renowned Cotton Club in the 1930s. She became the first black performer with a major Hollywood studio contract. In 1942, Lena moved to Los Angeles, where she appeared in such movies as "Cabin in the Sky," "Meet Me in Las Vegas," and "The Wiz." Her role in the film "Stormy Weather" included her rendition of the title song, which became her trademark.

A remarkable, charismatic entertainer, Horne became one of the top-earning performers of black Hollywood by 1945. Lena is now credited with paving the way for many black actresses in Hollywood who aspire towards larger roles in film productions. Though primarily known as an entertainer, Horne also was noted for her work with civil rights and political organizations. As an actress, she refused to play roles that stereotyped African American women, and by the 1960s, she became a prominent celebrity voice in the civil rights movement. She joined in the March on Washington when Martin Luther King gave his "I Have a Dream" speech and spoke at a rally with Medgar Evers. Her one-woman show, "Lena Horne: The Lady and Her Music," garnered many awards, including a Drama Critics' Circle Award and a special achievement Tony Award. In 1984, Horne received a Kennedy Center honor for lifetime contribution to the arts, and in 1989, a Grammy Award for lifetime achievement.

As a pioneer black celebrity in a time when blacks went in the back door, Lena Horne sang out, and she sang out front and entertained the Nation and the world. Her smile and her presence opened doors in a time when blacks were denied their basic civil rights. She lit up Hollywood. And we join the Nation, her family, her friends, and colleagues in mourning the loss of this legendary entertainer and civil rights activist.

#### REGULATING THE DOLLAR IS CONGRESS' RESPONSIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, how long is Congress going to sit idly by while the Federal Reserve destroys the value of the U.S. dollar? On Friday, May 7, our dollar was worth only one twelve-hundredth of an ounce of gold. That means that the dollar has lost more than three-quarters of its value in just 9 years, since 2001.

Let's not kid ourselves and think the value of our dollars in terms of gold doesn't matter. Where gold prices go, other prices follow. We are either going to see the dollar price of gold fall or we are in for a blast of inflation that will crush the middle class and lead to yet another recession.

If you think that this can't happen, let me remind you that is exactly what happened in the 1970s and the early 1980s. Do we want to go back to the 1970s? Do we want to have double-digit inflation followed by double-digit unemployment? Well, that will happen unless we stabilize the U.S. dollar.

And let's not kid ourselves and think that because the dollar is rising against the euro, all is well in America. The euro and the dollar are both headed off the financial cliff. The euro is just jumping first. Mr. Speaker, how can we expect to have a stable economy or a stable financial market without a stable currency? The dollar is involved in every single transaction we do. If it moves around, it takes everything with it. We have seen in the past 2 years just how high the cost of an unstable dollar can be.

Robert Mundell, the Nobel Prize-winning economist and adviser to President Reagan, says that it was the Federal Reserve that caused the real estate bubble and bust. He says that the Fed is responsible for the economic crisis we are in today. That makes sense. It takes a lot of power to do this much damage, and there is no economic power greater than money.

Here's what happens, and people are not stupid: When the price of gold heads up, people sense that inflation is on the way. The way you protect yourself from inflation is to buy real assets with borrowed money. The longer the inflation goes on, the more leverage builds up and the bigger the ultimate crash. Well, we got the bubble in real assets in 2001 to 2007 and the crash came in 2008. Do we want another one? Isn't 9.9 percent unemployment high enough?

Mr. Speaker, I have right here a pocket Constitution that many Members carry around with them. When all else fails, we ought to read the Constitution. It says in article I, section 8, Congress shall have the power to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures.

What this means is that Congress is supposed to set the value of the dollar. It is the constitutional duty of Congress to regulate the value of our money. But Congress ignores its legal obligation and does not regulate the value of money. What Congress does, it

gives the Fed the responsibility to regulate interest rates. But the Constitution does not give the Fed or any other government agency the power to regulate interest rates.

There's a lot of talk about how important it is that the Federal Reserve should be independent. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that any part of the government should be independent of the Constitution. All the Fed's vaunted independence has produced is two boom-bust cycles in 10 years, the second one worse than the first.

Mr. Speaker, there is wisdom in the Constitution. That is why I have introduced H.R. 835, which is called the Dollar Bill Act. This bill would fulfill Congress' constitutional responsibility to define the value of the dollar. By doing so, we can stabilize the value of the dollar and stabilize the American economy.

Mr. Speaker, we need to hold hearings on this bill. The American people want a stable economy and a stable financial market, so we need a stable dollar. It's time for Congress to buck it up and fulfill its constitutional duty and regulate the value of the dollar.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1415

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. KOSMAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KOSMAS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### HONORING CAPTAIN BRANDON BARRETT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that really concerns me about war is we lose so many fine young men and women in conflict, in the combat area. One of the finest young men in my district from Marion, Indiana, Captain Brandon Aaron Barrett, who was 27 years old, died Wednesday, May 5, while serving in Afghanistan.

Brandon was born January 21, 1983, in Albuquerque, New Mexico. As a child, Brandon was friendly and energetic, making friends with everyone he came in contact with. He played sports, and he dreamed of serving in the United States military. He wanted to be a marine.

After graduating from Marion High School in 2001, he went to the United States Naval Academy and he was very proud of that. He graduated from there in 2006. Upon graduation, Brandon was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 6th Marine Regiment, 2nd Marine Division, II Marine Expeditionary Force at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. Brandon deployed twice to Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, once

from March to October of 2008 and then again in December of 2009.

During Captain Barrett's distinguished career, he received multiple awards for his service. The awards that he received include the Navy and Marine Achievement Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal, and the NATO International Security Assistance Force Medal. He has also recently been posthumously promoted from first lieutenant to the rank of captain. His deep commitment to the United States Marine Corps and the men he led was insurmountable.

Brandon "Bull" Barrett will be remembered in Marion, Indiana, as a gifted athlete, avid outdoorsman, and a natural born leader. Those who knew him best will remember him for not only the loyalty and perseverance that served him so well in the Marine Corps, but also his unwavering dedication to the friendships of his youth in Marion. Throughout his life, Brandon kept the city of Marion close to his heart, coming home on nearly every leave, and always greeting everyone he met with a smile.

To the citizens of the State of Indiana, his fellow marines, and the countless others he touched, Brandon will forever be remembered as a hero. Our thoughts, prayers, and deepest condolences go out to his mother, Cindy; his father, Brett; his brother, Brock; and his sisters, Ashley and Taylor.

Mr. Speaker, one of things that we never really think about is the impact it has on other people in the Corps or in the Army or Navy when they lose one of their beloved fighting buddies. His captain, his commanding officer said in an article, "It's surreal." He said, "I keep expecting him to walk around the corner, big smile on his face." They can't believe he is gone. He said that everyone who knew him knew he was a leader, an officer, and a great man, and he is sorely missed.

I would like to say once again to his family, our condolences, our deepest condolences go out to you. Everyone in Indiana and throughout the country is very happy that he served this country with such great distinction.

[From The Chronicle-Tribune, Marion, IN, May 12, 2010]

BRANDON AARON BARRETT  
Jan. 21, 1983–May 5, 2010

Brandon Aaron Barrett, 27, died on Wednesday, May 5, 2010, serving his country in Afghanistan. He has recently been posthumously promoted from the rank of first lieutenant to captain by the United States Marine Corps.

Barrett was born Jan. 21, 1983 in Albuquerque, New Mexico. He spent his childhood befriend everyone he met, playing sports, and dreaming of becoming a soldier for the United States military.

Brandon graduated from Marion High School in 2001, and he was proudly accepted into the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Maryland. He graduated in 2006, joined the Marine Corps, and was promoted to the rank of first lieutenant on May 26,

2008. Barrett was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 6th Marine Regiment; 2nd Marine Division, II Marine Expeditionary Force at Camp Lejeune in North Carolina. He deployed to Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom from March to October 2008 and again in December 2009.

Barrett's awards include the Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal and NATO International Security Assistance Force Medal.

Brandon "Bull" Barrett was an outstanding athlete, an avid outdoorsman and a natural leader. He confronted every task with enthusiasm and accepted each responsibility with dignity. His passionate commitment to the Marine Corps and to his troops was insurmountable. Those who knew him will remember his loyalty and his dedication to friendship most of all. His eyes held no prejudice, and he greeted everyone with a smile. Brandon kept the city of Marion, Indiana closest to his heart, returning home on nearly every leave. To its citizens and to the countless numbers of lives that he touched, Brandon Barrett will forever be remembered as a hero.

He is survived by his mother, Cindy Barrett; his father, Brett Barrett; his sisters, Ashley and Taylor Barrett; his brother, Brock Barrett; and his grandmother, Carmen Johnson. Additional survivors include several aunts, uncles and cousins.

Visitation will be held on Friday, May 14, 2010 from 4 p.m. to 8 p.m. in the Marion High School Bill Green Athletic Arena, 750 W. 26th Street, Marion, IN 46953.

A funeral service will be held at 10 a.m. on Saturday, May 15, 2010, also at the MHS Bill Green Athletic Arena. A burial service will follow at Gardens of Memory, 11201 S. Marion Rd. 35, Marion, IN 46952.

In lieu of flowers, donations can be made for those wishing to contribute to a memorial and scholarship fund in Brandon's name. Please send contributions to STAR Wealth Management, Capt. Brandon A. Barrett Memorial Fund, 3610 River Crossing Parkway—Suite 190, Indianapolis, IN 46240.

Local arrangements are being handled by Needham-Storey-Wampner Funeral Service, North Chapel, 1341 N. Baldwin Avenue, Marion, IN.

Barrett was killed in Afghanistan a week ago today, 60 days before he was scheduled to return home from his tour in combat.

His sister, Ashley Barrett, said she and her family are looking forward to allowing her brother to be at peace by finally laying his body to rest.

More details regarding his killing were reported this week by The Sunday Times, of London.

"That article was very upsetting to read," Ashley Barrett said.

She said the information reported in the British newspaper was more than what the family received in the casualty report provided by the U.S. Marine Corps.

According to the article, under the headline, "Swift and bloody: the Taliban's revenge," a Taliban gunman shot Barrett while he was fortifying his post in the Helmand town of Marjah. Barrett and Lance Corporal Marcus Lounello, 21, did not have their flak jackets on because of the heat that day. The Times article said Barrett was shot in the chest as he stood between two armored vehicles and died before a medical team could reach him, and Lounello was also shot and suffered extreme internal injuries: Lounello is expected to recover.

"It's surreal" Captain Tony Zinni, Barrett's commanding officer in the 1st Battalion, 6th Marine Regiment, told the Times on Saturday. "I keep expecting him to walk around the corner, big smile on his face."

Barrett had been well known in Marjah, according to the article. He guarded a post that checked traffic coming in and out of the town that was once a Taliban stronghold. The city was taken over by the Marines and their Afghan allies in February. Zinni told the Times that it was generally a boring duty, but Barrett was good about it.

According to the article, Barrett would visit the neighborhood elders in Marjah, and could even partially speak their language—Pashto.

Zinni told the Times he thinks the lieutenant was targeted and it makes him angry.

"Everyone in the block knew him, knew he was the officer," the captain said of Barrett.

Barrett was the first death in Marjah for the battalion's weapons company.

Barrett's friend, Andrew Morrell of Marion, said the efforts Barrett made to know the elders in Marjah and learn their language was part of his character:

"The main reason why Jesus affected the lives of so many people in his ministry in Galilee is because he dwelt amongst the people. This is the exact same reason why Brandon made such an impact among friends, family, but even more, strangers," wrote Morrell, who, communicated by e-mail while in Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### CALLING ON MOROCCO TO RESPECT HUMAN RIGHTS AND RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues the precarious situation of Christians and other religious minorities in Morocco. In March, Moroccan authorities deported approximately 40 U.S. citizens and scores of our foreign nationals. The individuals deported

were charged with proselytism, which is against the law in Morocco. However, Moroccan authorities have refused to turn over any evidence or offer any explanation of the charges.

Among the individuals who were deported or denied reentry were businessmen, educators, humanitarian and social workers, many of whom had resided in Morocco for over a decade in full compliance with the law. Those deported were reportedly forced to leave the country within 2 hours of being questioned by authorities, leaving all of their belongings behind.

As a result, a number of organizations which were run by foreign nationals and provided vital community services have been shuttered. One organization which has been adversely affected is the Village of Hope orphanage in Morocco's Atlas Mountains. Time Magazine reported that: "The Village of Hope deportations are part of what appears to be a widespread crackdown on Christian workers in Morocco."

A New Zealand native and staff of the orphanage, Chris Broadbent, told Time that "most of the couples were there as foster parents and had raised these children since infancy."

Colorado couple Eddie and Lynn Padilla were amongst those expelled from the Village of Hope, forced to leave their two Moroccan sons behind. Mr. Padilla told 9 News Colorado that his 2-year-old son, Samir, "didn't understand what was happening but knew it wasn't good." He went on to describe the heart-wrenching story of their sudden separation and how Samir jumped into his father's arms and cried, "I want to go with you, Daddy."

The harsh nature of these expulsions call into question the longstanding friendship and mutual cooperation between the United States and Morocco dating back to the letter the Sultan of Morocco sent to George Washington at Valley Forge declaring that American vessels were permitted to enter Moroccan ports to "take refreshments and enjoy in them the same privileges and immunities as those of the other nations." This letter signified the first official recognition of our fledgling Nation.

I have worked with Moroccan and U.S. officials over the last 2 months in an attempt to find a satisfactory solution to this matter. Unfortunately, the Moroccan Government seems to be unwilling to compromise, as evidenced by a recent letter I received from a representative of the King.

Earlier this week, 10 additional foreign nationals were asked to leave the country. It is our responsibility to speak out on behalf of human rights abuses which have been perpetrated by the Moroccan Government.

President Reagan modeled this approach by consistently speaking out on behalf of the persecuted and tirelessly defending human rights and religious freedom.

Today I sent Secretary of State Clinton a letter asking her to issue a travel

advisory for Morocco so all U.S. citizens are aware of the potential risks. Additionally, the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, which I cochair, will hold a hearing on June 17 to further explore the issues of human rights and religious freedom in Morocco.

I call on the Government of Morocco again to uphold its commitment to the principles of religious tolerance and freedom that for so long made it a model of tolerance and modernity in the Arab world.

Again, I call on our Embassy, and I think our ambassador should be speaking out, the State Department should be speaking out, and the White House should be speaking out to raise this issue with Moroccan authorities at the highest levels in defending the rights and interests of these American citizens whose lives have been shattered by these events.

[From Time, Mar. 21, 2010]

#### IN MOROCCO, A CRACKDOWN ON CHRISTIAN AID WORKERS

(By Lisa Abend)

March 8 is not a day that Chris Broadbent will soon forget. The preceding weekend, gendarmes entered the Village of Hope, a Christian-run orphanage in Morocco's Atlas Mountains where Broadbent, a New Zealand native, worked as a human resources manager, and began questioning children and staff. At first, he and the other foreign workers were assured that the interrogation was routine. But as it dragged on, the questions turned to subjects like "How do you pray?" and the police began searching homes on the compound for children's Bibles. On Monday morning, after being held in a separate room from the orphanage's 33 children, Broadbent and his 15 colleagues were summarily deported from Morocco, accused of illegally proselytizing for their faith.

"Most of the couples were there as foster parents and had raised these children since infancy," Broadbent says. "When they were told that their parents had to leave, it was chaos—the kids were running after any adult they could find, and just holding on. It was the most devastating thing I've ever seen."

The Village of Hope deportations are part of what appears to be a widespread crackdown on Christian aid workers in Morocco. An estimated 40 foreigners—including Dutch, British, American and Korean citizens—have been deported this month, including Broadbent and his colleagues. Among them were an Egyptian Catholic priest in the northern city of Larache and a Korean-born Protestant pastor in Marrakesh who was arrested as he led services in his church. And this past week, authorities searched an orphanage founded by American missionaries in the town of Azrou called The Children's Haven. Salim Sefiane, a Moroccan who was raised at the orphanage and is still in touch with workers there, said the officials interrogated the orphanage staff and asked children as young as 8 years old to demonstrate how they pray. No action has been taken yet against the orphanage's workers, Sefiane said.

The large-scale deportations came as a surprise in a nation that is among the most liberal of Muslim countries. Although trying to convert Muslims to other faiths is illegal, Morocco tolerates the presence of other religions and is home to a number of churches and synagogues. "There are several things about this that are really striking," says Spanish journalist Ignacio Cembrero, who has written several books about the country.

"There have been occasional deportations of people accused of proselytizing before, but never so many at once, and they've never expelled a Catholic before. And for the police to enter a church on Sunday, during services, to arrest people? Absolutely unprecedented."

According to the Moroccan government, the deportees all broke the law, using their status as aid workers to cover their proselytizing. "They are guilty of trying to undermine the faith of Muslims," Interior Minister Tayeb Cherkaoui said in a press release.

But were they? Broadbent denies the charges. Part of his job at the Village of Hope was to ensure that staff members understood the rules prohibiting proselytizing, and he notes that all the orphanage's children received instruction in Islam. "We weren't teaching Christianity in any formal way," he says. But asked if reading the Bible to Muslim children constitutes proselytizing, he said, "We understood that it wasn't. And in any case, the authorities have always known that these children were being raised in Christian families." In fact, Village of Hope had been operating for 10 years and had received "institutional" status from the Moroccan government this year—a designation meaning it meets government standards. Many of the other deported Christians had also been in Morocco for extended periods of time. So why were they evicted now?

Christopher Martin, a pastor since 2004 at the Casablanca International Protestant Church, says he's talked to three different people with connections "high up in the Moroccan government" and heard three different explanations for the action. But one common thread, he points out, is that the officials leading the crackdown—the Justice and Interior ministers—were both appointed in January. That suggests to many Christians in Morocco that the officials were eager to quickly make a mark on the political landscape with an initiative likely to have broad popular support.

Although the Moroccan government has in recent years dramatically reformed its family law to better protect the rights of women and has even sponsored programs to train women as Muslim preachers, it has also proven responsive to an increasingly religious public. In recent years, alcohol licenses have become much more difficult to obtain, and last September, for the first time, police in various cities arrested Moroccans who were eating in public during the fast period of Ramadan. The action prompted a formal complaint from the international organization Human Rights Watch.

Aaron Schwoebel, the information officer at the U.S. embassy in Rabat, says that the Moroccan government has told the embassy there will be more deportations, including other Americans. He said the government did not indicate when. "We urge the Moroccan government to act in accordance with its highest traditions of tolerance," Schwoebel says, "and respect the human rights of the members of these religious minority communities, including those of our own citizens."

Now living in Spain after the gendarmes escorted him and his family to a departing ferry in Tangier, Broadbent hopes for the same thing. The last he heard, the Village of Hope children were still living at the orphanage, but he suspects they may soon be sent to other homes. "We'd like to open a dialogue that would lead to reuniting these families," he says. But in the meantime, he can only wonder about the meaning of it all. "Is this an isolated incident?" he asks. "Or is Morocco steering away from its tolerant past?"



ROYAUME DU MAROC, MINISTERE DES  
AFFAIRES ETRANGERES ET DE LA  
COOPERATION,

Congressman FRANK R. WOLF,  
Washington, DC.

HONORABLE REPRESENTATIVE, His Majesty King Mohammed VI acknowledges receipt of your letter regarding the repatriation measures taken against American citizens by the Government of the Kingdom of Morocco.

In answer to your request, I have been instructed by His Majesty the King, Commander of the Faithful, to share with you certain remarks and clarifications in the hope they may alleviate your concerns regarding this issue.

Firstly, I would like to assure you that the Kingdom of Morocco attaches great importance to its historic ties of friendship with the United States of America, with which it shares a unique and longstanding relationship which His Majesty the King seeks to preserve and deepen in all areas of exchange and cooperation.

The values of freedom, democracy and tolerance which brought us together in the past are still, today, the solid foundation on which we have erected an exemplary bilateral partnership characterized in particular, by an open, honest and candid dialogue. It is precisely this dialogue, pursued at all levels of society, which has always allowed us to bridge any temporal divides which may come between us by working, together, past them on the basis of our shared values and enduring interests.

In this spirit, I would like to expose to you my country's perspective regarding the issue presently at hand:

The repatriation measures which concerned, amongst others, a number of American citizens, solely and exclusively targeted proselytism activities which are clearly and categorically forbidden by both the precepts of Islam and Moroccan legislation, equally vouched for by His Majesty the King as Commander of the Faithful and Head of State.

The repatriation measures were not taken against the concerned parties in relation to their Christian faith, but because they had committed criminal offences, as proven by an investigation conducted by the relevant legal authority, namely the Crown Prosecution Office, following formal complaints, namely by parents and close relatives of the children concerned.

These measures should, thus, be construed as logical, legal and legitimate decisions resulting from a thorough investigation which established, on the basis of verifiable and substantial evidence that foreign nationals, under the pretence of conducting charitable actions, had engaged in proselytizing.

Under such circumstances, Moroccan authorities were obligated to fulfill their responsibilities by duly enforcing the Law, in full respect of the rights and dignity of the concerned parties.

Indeed, the choice of an administrative procedure of repatriation—as provided for by national legislation—instead of a legal procedure, was made to spare concerned parties the unavoidable ordeal which would result from a trial, no matter how fair it may be. In addition, were the concerned parties to feel they had been unjustly treated, Moroccan law provides them with the right to petition for nullity of the measures taken against them if these are found to be an abuse of power.

Moroccan Islam, founded upon values of openness, tolerance and moderation, is the fruit of long years of peaceful coexistence between the varied and rich strata of Moroccan society. It constitutes a central pillar upholding Moroccan society which needs to be preserved against any undermining or perversions.

Whenever this serene Islam has been targeted by proselytizing or heretical activities, Moroccan authorities were obliged to act, in all legality, to protect the faith of Moroccan society.

On this basis, it should be noted that repatriation procedures were regularly undertaken, these past years, against some of "our brothers in Islam" both from Shiite or Wahhabi rites. In all these cases, the same type of administrative procedure was followed.

Therefore, taking into account all these considerations, there can be no mistake about the intent and attitude of the Moroccan authorities in this issue. I can assure you that in no way whatsoever are these isolated cases in breach freedom of worship, which is guaranteed by the Moroccan Constitution. Nor can they be perceived as having any political or religious connotations.

The Kingdom of Morocco has always been a land of dialogue and exchange, as well as a crossroads where different civilizations, cultures and religions can meet. His Majesty the King, Commander of the Faithful, warrants the exercise of this freedom across the Moroccan territory as a whole and in an equal manner, for Muslims, Jews and Christians of all persuasions.

While remaining at your disposal should you wish any further explanations, please accept the assurances of my highest regards,

Yours Sincerely,

TAIB FASSI FIHRI,  
*Le ministre.*

#### REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1381), as amended by Public Law 111-114, the Chair announces on behalf of the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives and the majority and minority leaders of the United States Senate their joint reappointment of the following individuals on May 13, 2010, each to a 5-year term on the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance:

Roberta L. Holzwarth, Illinois;  
Barbara L. Camens, Washington,  
D.C., Chair.

#### PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I am claiming the time on behalf of the Progressive Caucus, which is that body within the Congress itself, that group of people who are dedicated to the ideals that have made America fairer, America more open, America more inclusive, and America more peaceful over the years. The Progressive Caucus, who believes that working people of America deserve fair wages, workers' rights, and things like that; who believe that our country should be at peace with the rest of the world, and who believe in diplomacy and who believe in talking it out and who believe

war is rarely a good idea, and when it is, it should be executed with the most amount of care for our soldiers and our veterans, and who believe diplomacy is almost always the right answer.

The Progressive Caucus, who believe immigration reform should be humane and that we should put ideas of family reunification and a path towards citizenship up front. The Progressive Caucus, which believes that during this time of financial fragility and uncertainty that we need a robust, strong reform bill that will hold Wall Street accountable so that the money of the American people is cared for in a safe and proper way. This is the Progressive Caucus, and this is the progressive message where the Progressive Caucus comes to the House floor to talk about issues of and concern to the American people, to explain the position of the Progressive Caucus to the American people and to talk about things that really matter and to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that the American people know that there is a progressive voice in Congress. That voice is the Progressive Caucus, and this is the progressive message.

Mr. Speaker, today the topic for the progressive message is Wall Street reform and jobs. Wall Street reform and jobs. A lot of people think about this Wall Street reform package that is moving its way through Congress and they think, You know what? I know this has a lot to do with me, but I am not exactly sure what. People know it was tax money that was pulled together during September and October of 2008, and that the Troubled Asset Recovery program was pulled together and salvaged some American banks to stop the whole system from going down. The American people know that. It was unpopular, nobody wanted to do it, but people knew it had to do with them and their tax money. The American people also know it had something to do with credit-default swaps and it had something to do with mortgage-backed securities; but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, this stuff is a little confusing and it makes a lot of sense for us to talk about it. But it makes sense to talk about it from the standpoint of jobs and businesses, particularly small businesses, and it makes sense to talk about it from the point of view of the consumer. So we will be talking about that today over the course of the next hour.

But before we do, I want to dive into a few things about jobs, about the state of our economy. The fact is that it is good news that we have seen some positive job news. On May 7, just a few days ago, the Department of Labor reported that 290,000 jobs were created in April. This is a good thing, but I am quite certain if you look around the neighborhoods and the farms and the rural communities and the urban centers and in the suburbs of the United States, there are still a lot of people not working. Positive job growth, yes, because the Democratic Caucus, led by a progressive voice, helped to make that



happen. But the fact is that there are still a lot of people out of work.

□ 1430

Much has been done. Much needs to be done because this 290,000 jobs in April is good, but the fact is we need about 300,000 jobs added per month in order to keep up with population. If we do less than that, the unemployment rate will remain high, and that is something that is wrong and we should do something about.

But I do want the American people to know that we've seen 290,000 jobs added in April. Good sign. And then we saw 231,000 created in the private sector, and that's a lot of jobs, and that's good, most of that growth coming from the private sector.

Those 290,000 jobs, new American jobs added in April, larger than expected and the largest gain since March 2006, that goes to show that addressing health care, addressing the stimulus package and the American recovery package are things that really help the American economy and are getting our economy back on the road to health.

But the question is, Mr. Speaker, what does it mean for so many people, still out of work. We still need a jobs bill. We still need to do something about jobs. And we need something to stimulate job growth in our public sector and in our private sector. This is undone work, still needing to be done.

We want to celebrate the good news, but we want to also talk about what else needs to be done. The good news is that this is the fourth consecutive month of job growth with 537,000 jobs added since December. So this is nearly a half a million jobs added, 84 percent of which is in the private sector.

So some friends on the Republican side of the aisle have said, oh, well, yeah, you know, you spend a lot of money in the recovery package and, yeah, you're going to get positive job growth in the public sector. But these jobs, the growth has been in the private sector, which means that the stimulus bill worked, and the American people are benefiting from it right now.

Also, it's true that in March sales of new homes increased about 27 percent, to 411,000 at an annual rate, the strongest since last July, the biggest monthly increase in 47 years. The biggest monthly increase in 47 years.

Home prices in February rose 1.4 percent, posting the first year-to-year gain in more than 3 years.

The unemployment rate, as I mentioned before, unfortunately, increased to about 9.9 percent. It went down to 9.7 and dipped back up to 9.9, about 10 percent. But this is a result of over 805,000 people entering the workforce because people feel that this is a time they might be able to find a job again. These people need to find that job opportunity, and that's why the Congress needs to pass more job legislation.

Over the past 3 months, we've added an average of 187,000 jobs per month, in

contrast to 727,000 average jobs lost per month during the last 3 months of the Bush administration. No one should ever forget that in the last month of the Bush administration, January 2009, January 2009, this economy lost 741,000 jobs. And that was about average for the last 3 months of the Bush administration.

Right now, we've seen a 290,000 job increase. The stimulus package worked. The Democratic Caucus is working, and we need more job growth in order to make sure that young people coming out of school in the next few weeks will have a job to do, and those folks who are still among the ranks of the unemployed can get work.

So since the Recovery Act, stocks have gone up across the board, the Dow has gone up over 70 percent, and the S&P 500 is up 80 percent, NASDAQ is up about 100 percent.

Last year, Americans' tax bills were at their lowest points in 60 years, since the Truman administration.

So just going on, Mr. Speaker, talking about the state of our economy, before we get to Wall Street reform, job growth seems to be moving up. We seem to be moving from this state of job loss to now job growth. Still we have 10 percent unemployment, and we've got to do something about it.

During the 111th Congress, this Congress, Democrats have taken a series of steps to make these positive job numbers a reality. I want to talk about those tonight, Mr. Speaker, because it's important that the American people know that, with the progressive vision, often led by the Progressive Caucus, that this Democratic Caucus has been doing the right thing for the American economy. For example, we passed the HIRE Act. This is a bipartisan bill to create 300,000 jobs with tax incentives for businesses that hire unemployed Americans. This is helping people out. And the HIRE Act is helping small business add people on their rolls so that they can work.

The American Workers State and Business Relief Act, this bill offers tax incentives, again, to spur business innovation and tax cuts for families with kids headed to college and disaster relief for States, combined with economy-boosting unemployment benefits and health care for Americans hit by the recession.

We also passed the Small Business and Infrastructure Jobs Act. This bill extends aid to States to provide subsidies to employers, including small businesses who hire unemployed workers that is on track to put over 160,000 Americans back to work. That's good news.

And then of course, last week, we passed the Home Star Bill, which will create much needed jobs in the manufacturing sector by—we passed the Home Star Bill, which gives tax incentives to renovate homes.

But also one bill that's been introduced is an important bill that will create much needed jobs in the manu-

facturing sector by providing tax rebates to homeowners who install energy-saving products. That's right. So that's the Home Star Bill.

Mr. Speaker, also, the Congress and the President have worked together to enact a whole array of broad tax cuts that working families and middle class families and small business owners can have, which ends the era of Republican tax breaks focused only on the wealthy.

It's important to point out, Mr. Speaker, that Democrats, even progressives, don't object to tax breaks. We just object to tax breaks for the people who don't need a tax break. American people working hard every day can use them, and we've been in favor of them.

All told, Congress has enacted more than 800 billion tax cuts with another 285 billion making their way through Congress in order to help spur innovation and employment for people who actually need it and can use it.

Congressional Republicans threaten to take us back to the failed policies that created the economic crisis. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be talking about Wall Street reform, which actually is the kind of reform that we need to correct what the Republicans have created, which is a failed economy, which the Democrats, right now, are trying to pull the American people out of.

Congressional Republicans are trying to take us back to these old policies. They want to side with the special interests, with Wall Street banks, credit card companies, Big Oil, and insurance companies. This is wrong, Mr. Speaker. And we're here to do something about it.

These economic and fiscal policies created by the Bush administration created the Bush recession, the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression of the 1930s, with job losses of nearly 800,000 a month during the Bush administration, and nearly doubled our national debt.

It's amazing when you hear Republicans talking about spending, given all the spending that they did, putting our economy at risk.

Republicans have voted against every single piece of economic legislation, from the Recovery Act to the Wall Street reform, choosing the special interests over the American worker and families and small businesses.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Democrats, the Democrats in Congress will continue to take America in a new direction, working to create American jobs and a new strong foundation for our economy, protecting Main Street and the middle class, and getting results.

I'm going to talk about one of those major reforms in just a moment. But during the last 3 months of the Bush administration, we lost an average of 726,000 jobs, Mr. Speaker. In the last 3 months we've created 186,000 jobs. The current unemployment rate is 9.9 percent. So we're coming back. We're moving up. We've got much more to do,

but that then sets the stage, Mr. Speaker, for the Wall Street reform discussion we're going to have tonight.

Mr. Speaker, let me start out with a very simple proposition, a very simple proposition. Wall Street reform is good for Main Street. Very simple proposition. Wall Street reform is good for Main Street. Wall Street reform is good for Main Street because if Wall Street creates a situation where they've got to have massive bank bailouts, that's coming out of the taxpayer, which is represented by Main Street.

We've got to make sure that we pass financial reform legislation that stops the bailouts, that stops the tricky and fine print and the hidden terms and the nonunderstandable and indecipherable contracts for credit cards. Wall Street reform is good for Main Street.

We need to create a situation, Mr. Speaker, where people who want to, if you want to sell a loan or you want to sell a mortgage you've got to keep some skin in the game. You can't just sell that mortgage and now you don't care if it's well underwritten. You don't care if you've made sure somebody's going to pay that loan back, because you sold the paper that's all you need to know. That's something that's got to change. All those things represent Wall Street reform. Wall Street reform is good for Main Street.

Main Street, whether Main Street's in Minneapolis, which is my town, or in Los Angeles or in Peoria, Illinois or in Laverne, Minnesota or any small town across America, or any big town across America, or any suburb or anywhere, Wall Street reform is good for Main Street. It protects our tax dollar. It protects the consumer, and it makes sure that there are fair, clear rules for Wall Street to live by. Not unfair rules, not rules that are bad for Wall Street, but rules which allow good actors on Wall Street to remain good, and allows the unscrupulous actors to get some punishment for what they have done.

But you've got to understand that if we don't have clear rules, clear rules of the road, then some actors on Wall Street will think, you know, by not doing shady things, we're losing out, so we'd better go do them. We don't want that. We want to have clear, fair rules to keep good actors good and to keep bad actors out and accountable when they're not out.

So that's what the main message is for today, Mr. Speaker. Wall Street reform is good for Main Street. Very important.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to talk to you for a moment about what Wall Street reform means. Some people think, well, what does Wall Street reform mean? This is a lot of complex stuff. Are we talking credit default swaps? Are we talking about derivatives? Are we talking about resolution authority? What does all this stuff mean?

Well, you know what? It's not very complicated at all. It's actually pretty

simple, Mr. Speaker. Wall Street reform means policing Wall Street, meaning have real regulators up there to actually hold some people accountable, no more Bernie Madoffs, no more folks who made off with the money.

Wall Street reform means ending bank bailouts. Everybody hated the bailout. In my opinion it was a necessary thing to do, but it was one of those kinds of things that we all hated to do. We need to end taxpayer-funded bailouts forever, and that's why we need resolution authority. And I'll talk about what that means.

And we need, also, Mr. Speaker, to stabilize the economy. We need to stop these wild bubbles. This bubble during the first decade of this century created a housing bubble which led to a, what, a bursting of the bubble, and we saw real, real pain: 2.8 million foreclosures last year alone, Mr. Speaker. We cannot revisit that kind of situation again.

And stop gambling with worker pensions. Some folks don't really realize how deeply involved Main Street is in Wall Street. But if you have a 401(k) or a pension or anything like that, Mr. Speaker, your retirement money is on Wall Street. We can't allow it to be gambled by people who are looking for no more than a quick return with very little accountability. That's what it means. Wall Street reform means policing Wall Street, ending bank bailouts, stabilizing the economy and stopping gambling with worker pensions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important for people who are out there listening, Mr. Speaker, to understand what it is, who's on the side of the people and who isn't. Who's side are you on is what this bill, this board asks, Mr. Speaker. Who's side are you on?

And the question is, Democrats represent Main Street. And that's why Democrats support jobs bills, as I just talked about, support unemployment insurance. Democrats support curtailing excessive Wall Street bonuses. We'll talk about those in a minute.

Democrats represent creating new consumer protection agencies so that the fine print, the tricky terms, they say 9.9 percent on the credit card until it's not. When is it not? Whenever they say it's not. We've got to stop that kind of thing.

□ 1445

And Democrats support tax cuts for small businesses and worker families, just as I got through talking about, and Democrats support regulating Wall Street and preventing foreclosures. All these things are what the Democrats are all about. All these things help the American people.

Now, what are the Republicans talking about? Because they are complaining a lot, and they always have a lot of criticism for our side. But Republicans, they opposed the jobs bills and the unemployment insurance. You know, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe one of them, not even one of them, voted

for the stimulus bill that helped to create that 290,000 job bump that we saw in April. None of them even supported the stimulus bill which has led us back to positive job growth. They were against it, even though they spent money on wars, spent money on Iraq, spent money on giving the richest people tax cuts. They oppose it when we are trying to get average working Americans some jobs and some unemployment insurance.

By the way, it's amazing, but they are against curtailing excessive Wall Street bonuses. They actually have the nerve to say stuff like, well, should we curtail the bonuses of professional athletes? Should we curtail bonuses of this person or that? Look, that's irrelevant. Those guys aren't asking for the American people to bail out their bank. This is about saying if a big Wall Street CEO wants to get a golden parachute after running the company into the ground like Stan O'Neal did Merrill Lynch, then maybe the American people should have something to say about it. If you want a bunch of money from the public trough, you shouldn't be flying around on jets just to come testify, getting excessive bonuses, stuff like that. It's just fair. So this is what we are talking about.

The Republicans opposed creating a new consumer protection agency. Wait a minute. You mean to tell me the American people haven't gone through 2.8 million foreclosures in 2009 alone all based on no doc loans, liar loans, loans where nobody even wants to figure out whether you can pay back the loan, where they just put pressure tactics on you to just sign, sign, sign, sign, sign. You mean to tell me you don't want somebody to watch and make sure that these loans are fair, that the terms of the loan are clear, that people understand what the interest rate is going to really be, that they really understand that the total amount you are going to have to pay for this house over the term of the loan, that you understand what negative amortization is, that this teaser rate is not going to stay at 700 bucks, it's going to jump to 1,100 bucks after the 2-year or 3-year period is over? You mean to tell me you don't want anybody to protect the American people from that kind of stuff? They say no. They say buyer beware, caveat emptor, that is their problem.

Democrats say you know what, if you have a fair product at a fair price that you are willing to disclose, go out there and use the American enterprise system to do it. But don't trick the people, don't sell somebody a horse that can't see and then when the person asks about it you tell them it sees just fine. Don't do that. Be honest. Be a good businessperson. That's what the Democrats are saying. The Republicans are saying buyer beware. They are saying we don't care. Just sell anything you want to whoever you want at whatever cost you want.

They oppose tax cuts for small businesses and working families. The

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, Mr. Speaker, actually gave tax cuts to about 95 percent of the American people. The American Reinvestment and Recovery Act gave tax cuts to about 95 percent of the American people. How many votes did the Republicans give us to help the American people get some tax cuts as opposed to the rich Wall Street types? None. They didn't want to help on that one. They were busy. They were against it. They were all worried about other things when we were talking about helping the American people out.

So, they oppose regulating Wall Street and preventing foreclosures. They are not in favor of that. Let me tell you, Democrats, Mr. Speaker, were working on antipredatory lending legislation during 2005, during 2006, during 2007, but we were in the minority. During 2008, the Republican caucus blocked it every step of the way. And now that the Democrats are in charge, we are moving full steam ahead to pass bills that will prevent predatory lending and stop foreclosure. And we would like a little help, but so far, Mr. Speaker, we haven't gotten any.

I talked a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, about Wall Street's pay record. And I talked about how the Republican caucus was against bringing in these excessive bailouts and these excessive bonuses for Wall Street CEOs, who by the way get TARP money, the public money. Wall Street's record pay. After receiving trillions in taxpayer-funded bailouts, the top 38 financial firms gave record pay to their employees in 2009. They gave your money, Mr. Speaker. They gave them the taxpayers' money. We are trying to stop that. We are trying to make sure they don't do that. But we are not getting any help from the other side of the aisle.

So they gave record pay to their employees during 2009. During the great recession, Wall Street pay in the billions. 2007, their bonuses were \$137 billion. 2008, \$123.4 billion. 2009, \$145 billion. That's incredible, particularly during a recession. But the Democrats are here to say no more. We will not allow you to do that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as a result of Democrats working hard to pass jobs bills, to push on this issue of consumer protection, to passing the Credit Card Holders Bill of Rights, what we have seen is this downward trend in the economy during the Bush administration breaking sharply upward during the Obama administration. During the Bush administration, \$15 trillion in wealth was destroyed between July 2007 and 2009 as home values plummeted during the foreclosure crisis. This is what happened during the Bush administration.

But when Obama comes in, the numbers start going all the way back up again. The road to recovery. U.S. household net worth going back up. And it's going back up every day. What we have got to do is stay the course and keep on building and strengthening

our economy by holding Wall Street accountable, by passing job-promoting legislation, and by letting consumers keep some of their money and given a fair deal.

So Mr. Speaker, let me just talk a little bit about some of these issues about how Wall Street reform is good for working Americans. So I want to go back to my first board. So Wall Street reform is good for Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to talk about ending decades of failed policies that ultimately caused a near complete collapse of our entire economy. We are here today to talk about what brought us the greatest recession since the Great Depression. Wall Street reform is good for Main Street. The crisis is the product of reckless actions of massive private financial institutions coupled with deregulation and non-regulation and no oversight while the Congress was under the watch of the Republicans and the Bush White House. These policies have come with an enormous cost to the American middle class.

Mr. Speaker, do you realize that \$14 trillion of net worth has been lost when we watched home values plummet during the Bush administration? Twenty-two percent in decline in net worth for individuals. Pensions fell. Pensions, Mr. Speaker, fell by \$28.4 billion. Pensions, what Americans rely on to care for them during the golden years, the value dropped so that people have to work longer. People who are hoping to retire cannot do so. Last year alone 2.8 million homes lost to foreclosure in 2009. Twelve million Americans relying on payday loans just to get by. Thirty-three billion dollars in bonuses for Wall Street executives.

Mr. Speaker, when we pass financial reform, including the Consumer Financial Products Agency, those 12 million Americans relying on payday loans to get by will have a watchdog watching over them to make sure they are not abused by sharp practices, fine print, and tricky terms and conditions. So when you hear Republicans talking about financial reform and how we shouldn't do it, and they don't want this and they don't want that, just keep in mind those 2.8 million homeowners who lost their home in foreclosure or those 12 million Americans who are relying on payday loans just to get by, relying on credit cards just to get by.

Who is going to make sure those terms are fair, that they disclose those terms, that somebody is watching out for that consumer? It will be the Democratic caucus and the President who passed financial reform. I do hope we get at least one Republican to vote for it, but I am not holding my breath.

You know, it's important to point out, Mr. Speaker, that when you hear Republicans talking about cutting redtape or letting the market sort it out, actually that has very severe implications for the American people. Cutting redtape means getting rid of regula-

tions. It's like calling the police officer on a beat redtape. It's like saying a regulator who makes sure that financial products are fair is redtape. It's not redtape. It's regulation that's necessary to make sure the American people are treated fairly.

Let's talk about what they really mean when they say cutting redtape and letting the market sort it out. It means no accountability and no responsibility for multinational corporations and Wall Street CEOs who gamble with our national well-being. And it means a basic assurance that if they have their way we will be back in bailoutville again. We will be back in this mess again. And that's why we've got to pass financial reform.

Since taking back control of the Congress we have seen the Democratic caucus take real action to help consumers. In December 2009, the House passed the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. The Senate is moving its bill forward now. The Senate is currently working on that bill, and it looks like it's going to come up soon. The House bill will protect consumers and investors and small businesses and put our broader financial system on more stable footing. The House bill will place badly needed regulation of things like derivatives, hedge funds, and credit rating agencies.

Mr. Speaker, let me just take a moment to help the American people understand what a derivative is. A derivative is kind of like a hedge. When the value of a particular security goes down, the derivative is supposed to cover that fall in value and make sure that you don't lose all altogether.

A form of derivative is a credit default swap. And basically what that is is that when you have a mortgage-backed security, that means a security that's traded but is backed up by mortgages, that if the value of that security falls down that credit default swap is supposed to pay. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this instrument, this credit default swap, is like insurance, but it's one of those air quote "like insurance." It is not really insurance, but it's like insurance. Because if it was insurance, it would be regulated by a State insurance commissioner who would make sure that that insurance company had the money to cover claims if there would have been a claim.

A regular insurance company says, you know what, if you are going to hold yourself out as an insurance company and you are going to write policies for people, you have to have enough money if there is an auto accident or a tornado or there is a loss of life or whatever we have insurance for. But when it comes to these credit default swaps, there was no such regulator. Nobody made sure that there was enough money to back the loss and pay the claims if those securities went down in value.

And because of that, when the mortgage-backed security market went

down because people were not paying on their mortgages because they were in foreclosure, and they began to make claims for those credit default swaps, there wasn't enough money to cover them. And the American people had to bail out AIG so they could pay those creditors. That's what a derivative is.

□ 1500

Derivatives are going to be regulated under the new financial reform. There will be that commissioner. There will be that regulator to make sure that this market works properly and that it doesn't cost catastrophic losses in our economy.

Hedge funds. Hedge funds are large funds generally held by wealthy individuals. They'll be regulated.

Credit rating agencies. These are agencies that issue ratings for bonds like a AAA rating or a AA rating or a BBB rating or other types of ratings that they can give. The fact is that these credit rating agencies, some of them, when they said that this security was AAA, it wasn't. Some of these assets that they said were good were not good. And when they went down in value, the people who relied on the credit rating agency were caught by surprise, and this is why these credit rating agencies are going to have reform. And it's a good thing, Mr. Speaker.

Now, let me just say the other thing that we're going to do in reform is—I mentioned mortgage-backed securities. A lot of people don't—it's like, well, what is that? Well, a mortgage-backed security is a security where—imagine that you have a house and you have a mortgage on that house, and then the bank is going to receive the money that the homeowner is paying on their mortgage. And imagine that the bank says, You know what? This homeowner owes me a stream of income. If you want it, I'll sell it to you. And the person says, Well, I'll buy it. And the person starts buying up a lot of mortgages, and then they take those mortgages and they bundle them up. That's a mortgage-backed security.

And then they take that mortgage-backed security and they bundle those up, and that's called a collateral debt obligation. Imagine a mortgage is an M&M, a bag of M&Ms is a mortgage-backed security, and a box of bags of M&Ms is a collateral debt obligation.

Now, imagine all of a sudden that somebody were to take that box of bags of M&Ms and kind of slice them up and sell them off. What it might look like is something like this. You might have—these things are called tranches. A tranche is nothing but a French word that means slice, and a slice is something that you have if you look at this mortgage-backed security.

This top tranche, mortgage-backed security, is made up of these tranches, each rated a little riskier than the next. So this top tranche is a AAA tranche. That's the one that the rating agencies tell us is a AAA tranche, and we rely

on them and expect that they are being honest and have done a good job in rating the risk of that top-rated tranche.

But then the next tranche might be one down here. This is a B—AA tranche, and one of the riskier tranches, so maybe down here, maybe you have BBB here.

So these things, you get it in a document. It's usually a document, and you can buy this mortgage-backed security or you can buy a piece of it and you can have an interest in it, and it will entitle you to a stream of income. But how valuable is it? How safe is it? How sound is it? It all depends upon how well the rating agency has rated risks for each tranche.

So if you look at this particular mortgage-backed security, this tranche's performance is referenced by multiple unrelated investment vehicles in 2006 and 2007. So if you have one of these things and you look at it, it will say that this is an index call, the ABX.HE, BBB rating, 0.06–2. Here it is. Then you have Mezzanine Fund, Hudson Mezzanine Fund. That means it has a lower rating for risk.

And you have these down here. Abacus. You have this one. And they're all down here. So these are all down the line and these are all high.

So this is what a mortgage-backed security could well look like as you look at the various tranches that descend in order of risk. The problem with this is that when they were—the risk was not properly assessed and evaluated, and when they began to decline in value, you began to have real trouble in our market. And it's because of a lack of regulation, which is going to be taken care of as Congress moves through financial reform.

Now, what does all of this mean? And we'll return to this in a moment. What does all this mean for working families? Working families might think, you know what? I don't know what a tranche is. I don't know what a credit default swap is. I don't know what a mortgage-backed security is. All that's true. But perhaps the portfolio manager of your pension or your 401(k) knows what it is and, therefore, it affects you directly.

Well, what this means, what it means is that financial reform is going to mean that bank loans, mortgages, and credit cards are going to be fairer, more affordable, more understandable, and more transparent. Financial reform is going to mean that there's going to have to be real disclosure and that the government is going to take some real responsibility to make sure that these credit rating agencies are properly assessing risk, are making sure that the companies that do it are properly assessing risk, are going to make sure that consumers are treated fairly, are going to prevent bailouts, and are going to make sure our economy has a more stable footing.

Financial reform is going to mean that it's going to ensure that consumers get the information that they

need in a clear, precise format regarding banks, mortgage services, and credit card companies.

Financial reform is going to prevent the financial industry from offering predatory loans to people who can't afford the repayment and that these loans are going to be properly underwritten so that people don't get in over their head.

Financial reform is going to put in place commonsense regulations to stop abuses by the financial services industry as payday lending and exorbitant overdraft fees. Overdraft fees. That's when you swipe your card, if you're 30 cents over, you may still have to pay \$39 for that overdraft fee even if you went out and asked for a debit card so that if you did go over by mistake the charge would be denied. And you might have to solve that problem some other way, but at least you wouldn't be deep into your account and have a negative balance.

Financial reform is protections against reckless Wall Street financial schemes, bad home mortgages for short-term profit, bad credit cards with hidden penalties for the average consumers, and it means protecting workers' life savings, pensions, and stopping Wall Street casinos. It means it guards against massive unemployment rates due to the near total collapse in our economy back in October 2008.

Financial reform also, Mr. Speaker, means putting into "too big to fail" financial firms. Too big to fail means too small to save. Too big to fail means reckless behavior by firms that are so large that no matter what they do, they know that we've got to bail them out, because if we don't, it will have real harm to all of us.

And that's what we're talking about. We're talking about doing something to stabilize our economy, defend our economy, protect our economy, and to make sure that the average American is not at risk and their financial future is secure.

So let me just go through some of the highlights of financial reform. Before I do, I just want to talk about some of the root causes again. And to do that, I want to get this mortgage-backed security back up here.

If you want to talk about what happened and, therefore, what we should do to fix it, you have to start at the fact that way back in the 1930s, Mr. Speaker, our economy went through a catastrophic drop known as the Great Depression. And during that time, forward-thinking politicians put things in place to try to help protect our economy, things like Glass-Steagall, which said that if you're a financial firm, you have to do what your core competence is; meaning, if you're a depository bank, you go do that; if you're an investment bank, you focus on that; if you're an insurance company, you focus on that.

And it went along that way very well, Mr. Speaker, right up until the mid-1990s, when Travelers Insurance

and Citibank came together—an insurance company and depository bank coming together. They wanted to do it. There was a big court case about it, and a lot of people at the time thought, You know what? That old Glass-Steagall stuff is so yesterday. Let's do something new and innovative and really unleash innovation. That's what they said.

It so happened that Glass-Steagall was not such a bad idea as we look back, but at that time they wanted to pass a bill called Gramm-Leach-Bliley. This is a bill that would basically allow firms to basically go out of their area of core competence, and so you'd have a Citibank purchasing an insurance company or you'd have a depository bank purchasing a brokerage house or an investment bank, and you just had kind of everybody doing everything.

What happened is you had bigger firms. They kind of dabbled in various areas. But as the business reality was changed because they were deregulated, Congress did not see fit to put in the kind of regulation that was required to make sure that the system was still essentially safe and essentially sound.

Reckless schemes began to emerge. We began to see more deregulation. In fact, in 1999, when we passed regulatory reform in the financial world, we also said that things like credit default swaps would not be regulated. They would just be out there on the market, because they figured the people who deal in these things are arm's length and they are sophisticated investors and they know what they're doing and what they do won't harm the rest of us. I guess we were wrong about that.

But what began to happen is that in the mortgage markets, we began to see people being—who wanted to buy a home, going into the mortgage market and they were beginning to be sold things that were called predatory loans. Now, this is what we call them. That's what they are. But what they were called is adjustable rate mortgages, ARMs. They were given ARMs, and sometimes they were given mortgages where they would get—for 2 years they'd pay a low rate, and after 2 years you'd have a balloon payment that would go up. Or after 3 years you'd pay a low payment, and then it would balloon upward.

Now, the mortgage market, the housing market is a market that had consistently gone up, it had kept increasing. So even if that happened, when you got to your balloon payment, perhaps you could go back to a lender and you could simply refinance your mortgage. How many Americans try to do that? Let me tell you. A lot.

But we assumed the housing market would always go up. But what if it flattened out or went down like it did over the course of the last decade?

The fact is that it was in the mid-1990s when Congress passed the law that told the Fed that they could regulate the mortgage market to make sure

that when people got into loans that were not good for them, that they could regulate.

Some of these 2/28s and 3/27s I mentioned had terms like “prepayment penalties.” If you wanted to pay off the loan early, you couldn't really do it, or if you did, you had to pay an extra penalty.

They had things like yield spread premium, meaning that if you sold—if you were a mortgage broker and were able to channel somebody into a higher-cost loan, then you, as the person who brokered that loan, might be able to get the spread of the difference between the lower-cost loan that they were qualified for and the higher-cost loan that you got them to bite on. So you incentivize people, pushing people to get into loans that were not as good as the ones that they actually qualified for.

Over time, we also had something called securitization, which meant that, as I said before, once that mortgage was inked and somebody bought the house and got the loan, that the paper on that mortgage could be sold and then pulled together into a mortgage-backed security. And we didn't require that the original lender keep any part of the risk of that loan, so they could just sell it off and it wouldn't make any difference to them if that loan was never paid off or not. So, therefore, their responsibility for underwriting that loan carefully, making sure the person could pay that loan began to go down because they weren't going to keep it on their books anyway.

So what began to happen over time, Mr. Speaker, is that we saw these instruments like mortgage-backed securities I mentioned before, mortgages being sold to somebody who packaged them together and then packaged them in an even bigger box and then set them up in these tiered investment vehicles, with the highest being supposedly the most safe investment, all the way down to the bottom, with the most risky investment being sold and then people buying parts of it; and then these instruments being hedged with things like credit default swaps, which didn't have anything to back them up if people made claims when these instruments lost value.

□ 1515

What began to happen is that credit began to get cheaper, low interest loans for long periods of time. As money was cheaper, people bought more houses. As people bought more houses, the price of them went up, obviously, and we began to experience a bubble in the housing market. And you began to see, like now, housing prices have dropped quite a bit. The problem is that people who bought at bubble prices now are underwater, meaning the loan on their house is higher than the amount of value that is in the house, which is a problem. Negative equity.

But what began to happen, Mr. Speaker, is that these mortgage-backed securities, as people began to lose jobs, as the economy started to flatten out, as the housing market started to flatten out, people began to not be able to pay, and the people who probably never should have qualified for a loan couldn't pay, and the value of these mortgage-backed securities began to decline.

As that happened, people started to get in really difficult situations, because what began to happen is that in neighborhoods all over America, houses began to get abandoned, people began to be foreclosed on. Either they had a house that they never really could afford but they bought it on a teaser rate, and so when it ballooned they couldn't keep the house; or when people could not afford it when they would lose their jobs, and then the foreclosures began to seriously mount. They began to get really big.

And then, as that began to happen to the housing market, people who wanted to go back and refinance their house didn't have any equity or had negative equity, and then the bank said: We just can't refinance you because there is no value in the home or maybe there is actually negative value in the home. At that point, we got to a crisis, Mr. Speaker.

What happened? The fact is, is that we began to have a real catastrophe. Very little oversight from government, government allowing people just to do—to let the market just go on. As I said before, caveat emptor. And real pain began to happen as the foreclosures mounted, as the failures continued on, as unemployment began to slump, because housing is a huge part of our economy. And if the housing market isn't moving, then a lot of people aren't working, which began to increase the cycle of the bust.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we see now is a real need to do something about the situation that we are in, a real need to take real affirmative action, to take real control over our economy.

So let's talk about what we are going to do to solve this problem. We are going to talk about reforming the financial sector of our economy. We are going to talk about adding greater oversight. We are going to talk about what it is that we need to do to make sure that we don't find ourselves in a very difficult situation yet again.

What we are going to do, Mr. Speaker, is we are going to do something about that predatory lending that I have talked about. We are going to stop predatory, irresponsible mortgage lending. Tough new rules on the riskiest financial practices; rules to stop excess speculation in derivatives and growing use of unregulated credit default swaps.

We are going to require investment advisers to act for the benefit of their client under the law, exercising the highest standard of care. We are going to empower investors with greater say

in electing the company board members, some of these companies that urged, urged, urged their employees to sell as many mortgages as they possibly could. Stories like from Countrywide, which was a huge predatory mortgage lender, which ended up having so many of the houses that they lent money for going into foreclosure.

We're going to stop the shadow banking system of small predatory institutions such as payday lenders, check cashers, mortgage loan originators, and many others who have disappeared as quickly as they arrived on the scene, and we are going to start regulating the unregulated.

We are going to stop "too big to fail," Mr. Speaker. We are going to stop "too big to fail" by saying we are going to have a fund that these big firms have to pay into based on the riskiness of their activity, so that if one of them goes down, that the people who will pay their creditors will be from that fund, not from the American taxpayer. It is kind of like FDIC insurance. Banks pay into a fund so that if a bank goes down, depositors are covered. And that is the money that goes to make sure depositors are covered.

This, what we call ex-ante, which means before the fall, fund would be paid, and it would make a lot of sense to do this, because the people who are in business who are doing these risky practices are the ones who should pay.

Now some people say we need a fund after a company goes down. If that made sense, Mr. Speaker, that would mean that the one who engaged in the risky behavior would be gone after everybody else had to pick up the pieces. That's not good economics, Mr. Speaker. We oppose that idea. We are talking about the Consumer Financial Products Agency, and the CFPB would have the power to stop unfair, deceptive, and abusive consumer financial products.

We would also have a board called the Financial Services Oversight Council, Mr. Speaker, who could study potential risks to our financial system and identify financial risks before it caused great harm to the economy.

And so, Mr. Speaker, that is the basic heart of financial reform. We need the American people to embrace it. It is good: policing Wall Street, ending bank bailouts, stabilizing the economy, and stopping gambling with pensions.

Now in the last few minutes, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about a subject that I think every American should know about, and that is the effort by Wall Street leaders to stop reform of Wall Street. There is a lot of money being spent, Mr. Speaker, to stop financial reform, a lot of money being spent to make sure that things like regulating derivatives, regulating of the credit rating agencies, regulating credit card companies, payday lenders, and making sure there is an ex-ante fund to resolve failing firms so that the American people don't have to fork it over. They are spending a lot of money, Mr.

Speaker. Wall Street is spending billions to kill reform.

In 2009, the financial industry spent \$465 million in lobbying Washington, \$1.4 million a day in lobbying Congress, \$1.1 million per Member of Congress. Actually, more than that. Actually, more than \$1 million. That's a rounding down; \$3.9 billion in the last decade, and employed 1,726 Washington lobbyists just to try to persuade Congress Members to not make changes to Wall Street.

Now the American people ought to know what they are up against. But let me just tell you, a well-motivated constituent always trumps a lobbyist. So, Mr. Speaker, it wouldn't be a bad thing at all if people let their Member of Congress know how they felt about the importance of regulating Wall Street.

The top eight banks, Mr. Speaker, spent about \$30 million in 2009 just on lobbying. JP Morgan Chase spent \$6.2 million lobbying last year, all to try to make sure that whatever comes out of Congress looks good for them.

During the first quarter of 2010, this year, the top 25 banks spent \$11 million, which is an increase of 5 percent from the same time last year.

What is going on during the first three months of 2010 that wasn't going on the same time last year? Financial reform, Mr. Speaker. That's why they increased their spending.

I would like to hear Members of the Republican Caucus defend Wall Street's spending to kill financial reform. I hope they do say, Well, it's okay for Wall Street to spend all this money stopping reform, because—I don't know what they're going to say, but I would love to hear it.

During the first quarter of 2010, the top 25 banks spent \$11 million total, which is an increase of 5 percent. And the fact is, is that of that \$11 million that the top 25 banking firms spent on lobbying, the top six of them, JP Morgan Chase, Wells Fargo, Citigroup, Bank of America, Goldman Sachs, and Morgan Stanley spent \$6.9 million on lobbying in the first quarter of this year. That's a lot of money. That marked a 4 percent increase from late last year, a jump of about one-third from the first 3 months in 2009.

But what is going on now that wasn't going on as intensely then? Wall Street reform. So they're putting more money in and they're trying to slow reform.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield back, and just say it has been a pleasure coming to the special order on behalf of the Progressive Caucus.

#### IMMIGRATION ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUJÁN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to be recognized by you to address the House of Representatives

in this most deliberative body that we are. I often come here; and in the 30 or so minutes that I spend waiting and anticipating my opportunity to address you, I also can't avoid lending an ear to the gentleman who often presents ahead of me. I sometimes think about what it would be like if I just could walk in here in the last 30 seconds and not feel compelled to rebut the previous 60 minutes.

I am going to just compress this a little bit so I can get on to the subject at hand that I came here to talk about; but, yes, many Republicans, and perhaps every Republican, will oppose this financial bill that has the Barney Frank bill sent to the United States Senate and become the Chris Dodd bill. In fact, I don't know any two people that would probably have less favor in rewriting the financial laws in America than those two individuals.

They have had a long time now to investigate what has happened with the finances in America and what has happened with the downward spiral of our economy, and when this happened. It started before this seminal date, but the seminal date, Mr. Speaker, was September 19, 2008, when then-Secretary of the Treasury Henry Paulson came to this Capitol and asked for the \$700 billion in TARP funding. Then-Senator Obama, and now-President Obama, supported all of those moves. President Obama as Senator and later as President supported the takeover of the banks, the insurance companies, Fannie and Freddie, General Motors, Chrysler. And, by the way, the student loan program, not to mention ObamaCare. And now we have the financial world and an effort to take that over. And yes, I will stand and oppose these changes. I will stand and oppose them for a lot of reasons, perhaps that I will have an opportunity to get into a little bit later in this hour, Mr. Speaker.

The Federal Government should not be making arbitrary decisions on which businesses succeed and which ones fail. They should not be in a position to be evaluating. And if there is credible evidence of an entity, a corporate entity, a financial credit entity—credible evidence as to whether they might be in trouble, that would give the Secretary of the Treasury the authority to pull the plug on a company, take it over by the Federal Government, separate it any way he so chose; or, bring regulators in to intimidate them before or after the fact.

This bill, this Chris Dodd bill or Barney Frank bill, gives the Federal Government the authority to take over any business in America that is a credit business that they should choose.

Now, again, I hope to get to this. But at this moment, Mr. Speaker, I would transition this subject over to the subject that I came here to speak about, and that is right now we have Attorney General Holder testifying before the House Judiciary Committee. I came directly here from there, or I will say almost directly here from there, having



listened to a measure of his testimony and his response to some of the people that are on the Judiciary Committee. And as this unfolds yet, I come here because I am dissatisfied with the responses that I have received from the Attorney General. I actually think that he is a fine fellow and he would make a good neighbor, but I am concerned about the politicization of the Justice Department.

And even though Attorney General Holder made remarks at the end of my question period that their office would not be political, they would be impartial, they would function under the law, I happen to have a special view of Attorney Generals. And whether they be State Attorney Generals or whether they be U.S. Attorney Generals, they have to understand the Constitution. They have to understand the rule of law. They can't know every Federal statute. I wouldn't hold anyone accountable for that. But when they have had an opportunity to do an investigation or had an opportunity to brief themselves on a subject matter that is bound to come up, I would expect that they would be conversant enough with the law and with the Constitution to be able to make an argument that would defend the actions of the Justice Department at a minimum.

□ 1530

And so I made the remark and posed this situation. And this is off of the opening statement of Congresswoman JUDY CHU, who said that Arizona law—and this is with Attorney General Holder, the sole witness before the committee and he was the audience that she was speaking to—she said, Arizona law is cruel and it institutionalizes racial profiling. She also said that people are “already being detained because they forgot their driver's license at home.” She continued and said that it's burdensome and unnecessary for people to carry multiple forms of identity, which reminds her of living in a Cold War state. I don't know what Cold War state she may have lived in. But I made this point to Attorney General Holder and asked him if there was anything in his knowledge that the Arizona law could be doing now that would affect the activities of the law enforcement officers in Arizona in such a way that the allegations by Ms. CHU could be accurate; that they're already detaining people because they forgot their driver's license at home, and that it would institutionalize racial profiling.

Mr. Speaker, this is the highest level deliberative body of the world and this dialogue has gotten down to this point where we have people that are representing a State law that's very well known by now that specifically prohibits racial profiling and prohibits the utilization of even the factor of race if it's the sole factor. That's by law. It's an Arizona law. And to have a Member of Congress say to the Attorney General in a hearing when the Attorney

General is under oath that people are already being detained. People are already being detained on an Arizona law.

Here's the quote: “Already being detained because they forgot their driver's license at home.” They also said the law is cruel and it institutionalizes racial profiling. It's as if this law had already taken effect. And it's a fact that Arizona law, unless specified otherwise, does not take effect until 90 days after the Governor signs the bill, which was some couple or three weeks ago. It's certainly not 90 days, Mr. Speaker.

As I point this out to the Attorney General, one would think that a person that is at that high level in this country with this very high-level responsibility could at least concur that the Arizona law hasn't been enacted yet. But he could not bring himself to do that because that would have caused him to come into a political disagreement with the activists on the Democrat side of the Judiciary Committee, the most polarized committee on the Hill. Now that's a presumption on my part on his motive, but it seems to fit a pattern.

He admitted that he has an investigation going on looking into Arizona immigration law. And when I made the point that the President of the United States had announced that he had directed the Attorney General to look into Arizona immigration law, I heard no rebuttal. I twice presented to Attorney General Holder that the President has directed that this happens. So if the President of the United States directs the Attorney General to conduct an investigation into State statute, on what basis is the follow-up question to Attorney General Holder?

They've been investigating now for some weeks. And what is the basis of your investigation? Well, Constitution, statutory, the principle of Federal preemption of State law. Now that's a general answer that you can pick up in any law school or many articles in the newspapers these days about Arizona law itself. And so when I followed up with a question of specifically where in the Constitution do you have concern about Arizona law and where in the Federal statute would you have concern about Arizona law perhaps violating the Federal statute and stretching beyond the bounds of Federal preemption, I got a generalized answer that, Well, it's been the practice that the Federal Government has dealt with immigration law. The practice, the implication.

We have the Justice Department investigating Arizona. We have the Justice Department investigating Sheriff Joe Arpaio, the sheriff of Maricopa County. They have targeted him for months and months and months because he's politically incorrect. He enforces Federal immigration law. It violates the activists that help support the President. But we can't find out that it violates any Federal statute,

any constitutional requirement that's there.

I believe from what I've seen—and I've visited Tent City and Sheriff Joe Arpaio on the border and I have gone to that border many times. And I'll go back again, Mr. Speaker. But when we have an Attorney General that's committing the resources of the United States and the resources of the taxpayers to investigate a law in Arizona that enjoys at least 70 percent support of the people of Arizona, a significant majority of the support of the people across this country—that mirrors Federal law, and when you have a Secretary of Homeland Security, Janet Napolitano, who's a former Governor of the State of Arizona, who admittedly had her tugs of war with Sheriff Joe Arpaio when she was the Governor and he was the sheriff, one would think that an administration, a President of the United States, an Attorney General, a Secretary of Homeland Security would have jumped for joy that Arizonans have decided to use their State resources to enforce the Federal immigration laws that the Federal Government is not enforcing adequately enough.

Instead of jumping for joy, instead of going down and giving Sheriff Joe Arpaio a high-five or maybe the Governor of Arizona another high-five or a good “atta girl” for signing that bill and for the work that was done in the State legislature, particularly that led by Russell Pearce, whom I have watched for some time and appreciate a great deal—we can't have the Federal Government, obviously, supporting something that the American people want, the Arizonans demand.

It was almost a primal scream of desperation that caused the Arizona legislature to pass the legislation that mirrored Federal law so that they are going to prohibit sanctuary cities within Arizona and require local law enforcement to support Federal immigration law by setting up a State law that makes it against the law to break Federal immigration law. That's not technically correct, but it is the analysis that best describes it, Mr. Speaker.

Our Attorney General is spending resources to investigate Arizona and still can't point to a single place in the United States Constitution or a single Federal statute that he thinks could be the cause of concern. When I asked him, he said, Well, it's under investigation, and it's inconclusive at this point.

Well, I read through the Constitution and I came to a conclusion. As far as the constitutional understanding is concerned, it is this: there's two places in the Constitution that could be relevant with regard to Arizona immigration law. One place where it says the Federal Government has a responsibility to guard against foreign invasion. Well, now, we could talk about what a foreign invasion is, but when it's 4 million people a year pouring across our border illegally and at best

we can interdict a fourth of them; when we have twice the size of Santa Anna's army coming across our border every night, one might define that as an invasion.

They aren't all carrying weapons. In fact, very few of them are. But I will guarantee you there have been more weapons carried across that border in the hands of people who are coming in here illegally than all the weapons that were carried in the hands of Santa Anna's army when he came across into Texas that 150-some years ago.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution requires the Federal Government to defend against invasion, but it doesn't prohibit the States from defending themselves against invasion. I would hope the Attorney General would understand that principle. I address that because there's only two places in the Constitution that address immigration. And I think that I have handled that issue so that it's essentially not rebuttable.

Then the other point is article I, section 8 of the Constitution, the other place where immigration is dealt with, where it says that Congress shall have the power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization. A uniform rule of naturalization. Well, what can that be? That means that Congress sets the legal immigration laws with regard to how people come into this country and become citizens. We do that. We have set those standards. But there's nothing in the Constitution that prohibits the States from passing their own immigration laws unless they are attempting to preempt existing Federal law or unless those laws are unconstitutional.

So one would think that an Attorney General that had all of these resources investigating Arizona law and was aware of the investigations that are going on of Sheriff Joe Arpaio, when there are allegations of violations of civil rights down in Maricopa County, all the resources poured into that, I've yet to find any substance. And still, millions of dollars are being spent, all kinds of time is being burned. There's all kinds of politicization going on. And the Attorney General swears there is not, that his office will not be political.

Well, I will submit, Mr. Speaker, that when the President of the United States says, Here's what could happen under Arizona law if a mother and her daughter are going out to get some ice cream, somebody can come along and say, Where are your papers? Anybody remember that? I do, Mr. Speaker. And so that was making this law political. The President of the United States made it political. And he's the man that that ordered a Justice Department investigation of Arizona? And he alleges—the President alleges—that it's race-based and racially motivated when the law itself specifically prohibits that from happening. We can't have the presumption on the part of the President of the United States or

the Attorney General that the law enforcement officers in Arizona are motivated by something other than race. Maybe they're motivated to support the rule of law. Couldn't we presume that that's it? That's the case. That's their oath. Can't we tell by their practice that they have enough to do without targeting?

Look at the crime across Arizona. Phoenix, the second highest in the hemisphere. And kidnapping. The kidnapping, the smuggling, the deaths, the murder rate, crime rates over the last 10 years in Arizona have gone up. The illegal border crossings may have tempered down just a little bit, but on the other hand, it might just be that Janet Napolitano's operation isn't as aggressive as it was under even Michael Chertoff. But I suspect that even then they had diminished their enforcement.

When you make the argument that your interdictions on the border have gone down, therefore you're getting the border under control, it might just be you're not doing your job as aggressively as you were before. There can be twice as many people crossing the border, and you can be picking up half as many as you were before. But that doesn't mean the half as many you're picking up equates into fewer people crossing the border. That may be. In fact, I expect it is true that fewer people are crossing the border. But it doesn't equate that the enforcement is any better than it was. It may be better. It may be worse. But it's not conclusive.

What is conclusive here is the Department of Justice has become political. It is a political tool. It saddens me to see this and hear this and to have to make this argument here on the floor of the House. But I didn't come, Mr. Speaker, lightly armed. I only point out the Arizona component of this because that's the dialogue that just took place within the last hour or so. The Department of Justice is investigating Arizona for constitutional statutory violations but cannot point their finger to a single place in the Constitution or a single controlling Federal statute.

And, by the way, I would point out also that, according to Federal case law, the precedence that we can find, that there is ample precedent that local law enforcement has the authority to enforce Federal immigration law, with or without a 287(g) agreement and a memorandum of understanding, which has been somewhat gutted by Secretary Napolitano. The precedent that I would cite would be *U.S. v. Santana-Garcia*, a Supreme Court decision that establishes that local government has the ability—local law enforcement—has the constitutional authority to help enforce Federal immigration law.

I would go on further with this: that Sheriff Joe Arpaio is on solid ground. They would have found a way to crack him by now if he were not. It's been, I believe, politically motivated. The ef-

fort to go down and make race the issue when it is law enforcement that is the problem and that Federal immigration law that's not being adequately enforced is the problem. The Attorney General should be able to at least defend the actions of his Justice Department, even though implicitly agreed that the President had directed that there be an investigation. Based on what? The President's supposition that a mother and her daughter would be perhaps of the wrong skin tone and they would be picked up and asked for their identification because they went out to get some ice cream?

It seems the President has an inclination to engage in these kinds of things. When he had an Irish cop and a black professor, who did he side with? He jumped to a conclusion without having heard the facts, and he ended up having to have a beer summit.

□ 1545

Well, maybe we could have a summit with Sheriff Joe Arpaio on the South Lawn of the White House, and they could sit down at the picnic table together and discuss these things so that all of the resources of the Federal Government don't have to be tied up in knots on these suppositions for the unfounded presumption that there is something unconstitutional about Arizona law or something that violates Federal statute.

I see that I am joined on the floor by the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, who has just come from the hearing of the Attorney General. I would be so happy to yield as much time as he may consume to Mr. SMITH from Texas and thank him for joining me here on the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding, and I also want to thank Representative KING for his good work on the Judiciary Committee. I have just been listening to his last few comments and appreciate his pointing out so many facts about immigration law and about what is going on there.

The reason I wanted to be briefly recognized is because we've had some recent developments in some poll results just in the last day or two on some of the same subjects that the gentleman from Iowa has been discussing. It's no surprise, for example, that in the latest Pew poll, it shows that only 25 percent of the American public approve of President Obama's handling of the Nation's immigration policy. The Obama administration is not enforcing our immigration laws and, in my view, has failed to protect our borders.

Arizona, which is trying to do what the Federal Government has not done, continues to enjoy strong support for its policy. According to the most recent Pew poll, 73 percent of the public support requiring people to produce documents, verifying their legal status if police ask them to do that, and 67 percent of the public support allowing police to detain anyone who can't

verify their legal status. And just today in *The Wall Street Journal*, there was a *Wall Street Journal-NBC News* poll. It asked the American people a number of questions, but one of them was about the Arizona law. And 64 percent, according to the *Wall Street Journal-NBC News* poll that was just today in *The Wall Street Journal*, 64 percent of the American people support the Arizona law. Let me say that that's actually, I think, gone up from 60 percent last week to 64 percent today. Almost two-thirds of the American people support what the folks in Arizona are trying to do. And we probably ought not try to second-guess what they are doing.

The residents of Arizona know they have a problem on their hands. Phoenix is the kidnapping capital of the United States right now. People in Arizona see that human smuggling that crosses their border, they see the drug trafficking that comes across their border. Several thousand people have been killed within sight of the Arizona-Mexico border in the last several years. So to me, the people in Arizona are really crying out for help from the Federal Government to protect their borders, but the Federal Government is not responding, and this administration is not responding. The message from the American people and the message from the folks in Arizona is that we want to see immigration laws enforced. And believe me, the message from Arizona is not, "We need amnesty for people in the country illegally," it's that we need to enforce our immigration laws.

And let me go back to that most recent poll where you have two-thirds of the American people wanting to enforce immigration laws and supporting what Arizona residents have done in regard to immigration laws. By the way, that includes, as I recall, about 60, 61 percent of all Independents. And most tellingly, it includes half of the Hispanics across the country, who are also in support of the Arizona law that was just passed, enforcing immigration laws and trying to make their best efforts to reduce illegal immigration.

So I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa yielding. I just wanted to bring everybody up to date on the most recent poll. And the poll is even more surprising. The poll, which shows that almost two-thirds of the American people support the immigration law that Arizona has just passed, is even more surprising because another Media Research poll shows that in the coverage of the Arizona law, the three networks, ABC, NBC, CBS, have actually aired 12 negative stories about the Arizona law for every one positive story. So you have a degree of media bias on the subject that has, frankly, been unseen. I think when it comes to immigration, the national media, including the three networks, probably do their worst job of reporting and show their greatest bias. This I consider to be a threat to democracy. When the networks and the national media are not giving the

American people the facts and instead are trying to tell them what to think, that is a danger to democracy.

Also, according to a Media Research Center, for example, only 1 out of 10 stories have actually mentioned that a majority—70 percent of the residents of Arizona—support the Arizona law. As I said, a great majority of the American people support the Arizona law, and yet the media are not reporting it. Considering that 12 to 1 negative coverage of the law and the fact that two-thirds of the American people still support it shows how strongly people across the country feel.

There is nothing wrong with wanting to enforce immigration laws. There is nothing wrong with wanting individuals to respect law and order. The American people know that, and I thank them for knowing that, and I thank them for not being persuaded by a very liberal media bias. And also, again, I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa and his yeoman's service, hard work, diligence, and commitment to such an important issue.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, and I asked if the gentleman from Texas could yield for a question before he moves on to his other important duties. And that is, I am a bit perplexed that the Attorney General couldn't or wouldn't point to a part of the Constitution that he thought might be violated by Arizona law or point to a Federal statute that might be violated by Arizona law or point to a piece of Federal case law that would prohibit local law enforcement from enforcing Federal immigration law. And would the gentleman from Texas have any idea how that question might have been answered by an Attorney General better informed?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. The gentleman is correct. I do not believe the Attorney General answered the questions on that particular subject. And while I was out of the room, I understand in response to a question asked by a Texas colleague that he admitted that he had not even read the Arizona law. And if that's the case, that is both surprising and disturbing. Again, I thank the gentleman for his good comments on the subject.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, and I very much thank the gentleman from Texas for illuminating the subject matter and especially the polling component of this. One would think that the Attorney General, as he was preparing to come before the Judiciary Committee—and historically, the Attorney General has briefed himself for several days with people who will ask questions and, I will say, play out a role so that he can be tested, prepared, and ready to testify before Congress. One would believe that the Attorney General, that the first thing that he would be briefed on is Arizona immigration law. The Justice Department is investigating Arizona, and yet there seems to be not a realization of what's going on. He admits to the investiga-

tion. And to not have read the law and perhaps not read the summary—

Mr. Speaker, I need to put the little bit of this in the RECORD from memory of what I have read of the immigration law, which is actually most of it. That it mirrors Federal immigration law, and it makes it against the law to violate Federal immigration law, but it's the law that is set up—it's mirrored and written by the State of Arizona. And I thought I had a summary of it here. Should I be able to find that, I will speak to it factually, but otherwise from memory.

But in any case, it allows for—if a law enforcement officer encounters someone in the normal practice of their doing their duties, they have to have probable cause to stop someone. Probable cause might be speeding, an accident, a crime that's taken place, a traffic violation. And once they pull over a vehicle, for example, they can ask for identification, like they would for anyone that is driving under any other stop. If then at that point, they have probable cause to stop the vehicle or encounter an individual, then, if the identification isn't adequate for, let's say, driving, then there's a reasonable suspicion for that officer to ask a few more questions. That officer can ask some questions such as: Where are you going? What are you doing? Where are you coming from? Where were you born? Why don't you have a driver's license?

And if the individual hands the officer a Matricula Consular card, that's pretty much conclusive evidence that they are in the United States illegally, and there isn't any other purpose to have one other than to function in the United States by those entities that will recognize it. It's issued by the Mexican consulate. It's not a valid U.S. ID. And if they're U.S. citizens or if they are lawfully present in the United States, they will have immigration documents or U.S. identification. And the immigration documents for legal immigrants, they are required to carry on their person. So people lawfully present in the United States who are not citizens—let's just say they have a green card, and that green card allows them to legally work in the United States, they are required to carry it on their person if they're 18 years old or older at all times. Arizona law just respects that. That's a Federal law. Arizona law respects that as well.

So this is probable cause to stop someone, reasonable suspicion that they're unlawfully present in the United States in order to follow through with any further questions or any further inquiry. Now if people boil out of the back of the van and start to run off into the desert, that's more than reasonable suspicion. And yet the objections that are coming from the people who are protesting against Arizona law are the objections that we're hearing from—I guess before the Judiciary Committee and a person of Representative JUDY CHU, who already alleges that Arizona's law is cruel and it

institutionalizes racial profiling. No, it prohibits racial profiling as far as an exclusive component of reasonable suspicion or probable cause. She said, People are already detained because they forgot their driver's license at home. Who's doing that? They're not detaining people because of that, not under the color of this new Arizona immigration law, because it's not enacted yet.

We're already hearing the fears, and the Attorney General is investigating because the President has apparently decided for some political reason that they need to do something to suppress Arizona from enforcing Federal immigration law, instead of saying, attaboy, attagirl. It's about time that the State stepped up to help out of frustration. If the Federal Government had done their job, there wouldn't be an Arizona immigration law. But they are not. They are ineffective. They lack the will. And that's our problem. It's not lack of resources; it's lack of will to enforce Federal immigration law. It's not lack of resources.

Three years ago or so, a little bit more, we were spending \$8 billion to protect our southern border. That's a 2,000 mile border. So, Mr. Speaker, I know you've already done the math. That's \$4 million a mile, \$4 million a mile to protect our southern border, and I said then, If you give me \$4 million to protect a mile of border, I will be happy to take that check, and I can warranty my work. I could guarantee you that we aren't going to let anybody cross that mile for \$4 million. Now the price has gone from \$8 billion to protect our 2,000-mile southern border to \$12 billion to protect our border, and still we have ineffectiveness because we have a lack of will and a lack of clarity of mission. And it comes from the top down. If it's clear that the President doesn't want the borders enforced, the Secretary of Homeland Security seems to not want to enforce against illegal workers in the workplace. She seems to want to just simply posture to enforce against employers.

Now I admit that there are many Border Patrol officers and CBP personnel and ICE personnel who go to work every day who do their job very well. In fact, I congratulate them for that. They want to do that. They put their lives on the line every day. They deserve our support. They deserve our adulation many times. But they're burdened by a lack of mission, and even though the mission is posted on the wall down at the station in Nogales, that mission has got to be something that the top articulates. And if the President of the United States articulates something else, when Arizona passes an immigration law that mirrors Federal law, and the President attacks Arizona law and inflames public fears in an erroneous fashion, what more could he do to undermine Arizona law and Federal immigration law?

He has said to everyone that's enforcing—not just local law enforcement that's enforcing immigration law. He

has said to all of his Federal officers from the White House down, ICE, CBP, Border Patrol, all of them, well, he really doesn't want to see immigration law enforced. And it's clear, of course, that he doesn't want to have racial profiling used, and I would agree with him—as an exclusive component. However, if it's part of the other indicators, it had better be used. Would we say that we can't use as an indicator when it comes time to enforce the law against international terrorism that a young Middle Eastern male cannot be considered as one of the factors? We've kind of said that when people go through the airport. I think it's wrong. I think it's foolish. And in fact, Mr. Speaker, I think it's downright stupid to set aside our common sense for the sake of political correctness.

So an Arizona law, though, goes to great lengths to make it clear that race cannot be the sole factor when evaluating reasonable suspicion or probable cause. How much further could they go? It reminds me of the official English law that I spent actually 6 years getting established in Iowa. We have demonstrations and protesters. I would say, Come into my office, sit down, tell me what your concerns are. Hour after hour, I listened. We had witnesses before the committee. And it was about how their language would be disparaged. So we wrote right into the law that it was unlawful to disparage any language in Iowa other than English. And do you know, I don't know that anybody's disparaged English either, but they haven't disparaged any other language in Iowa.

These fears that are mounted by that 1 percent or 2 percent or 3 percent of the aggressive liberals, they wouldn't come to pass. They didn't come to pass when we passed an official language law in Iowa or the 20-some other States. And furthermore, the fear about reasonable suspicion, giving law enforcement an excuse to target someone that they don't like because of racial reasons, that isn't going to come to pass. It may be a wild exception somewhere out there in the barest little minority of law enforcement officers, but it's not going to come to pass. This is a presumption that the law enforcement officers are racist and that they're biased and that they're bigoted against a particular race. And many of the communities in Arizona have a significant percentage—and in some communities, a majority of their law enforcement officers are Hispanic, and yet we're going to label all law enforcement officers in Arizona as racist without one scintilla of evidence and have allegations by Members of Congress, as Ms. CHU, or the President of the United States, or, by his silence, or refusal, or his reluctance, I should say, to respond to the points that I raised with him, the Attorney General of the United States.

□ 1600

It creates a perception that this is a racist society and that we can't even

have logical laws that uphold the rule of law because somebody will abuse those and stretch the limits and target someone.

Now I will tell you, and we heard from Mr. SMITH, statistically, the law enforcement officers in Arizona have enough to do without that. They are faced with the highest kidnapping rate in the United States, second highest in the entire hemisphere. They have murder rates that have gone up, kidnapping rates, drug smuggling rates that have gone up, and violence that has gone up. The coyotes are taking the lawlessness from Mexico into the United States. Ninety percent of the illegal drugs consumed in America come from or through Mexico. And 100 percent, according to the Drug Enforcement Agency, 100 percent of the illegal distribution chains in America have at least one link that is the link that is provided by an illegal that is in the United States.

So, if by some magical formula everybody woke up tomorrow morning in a country that they were lawfully residing in, it would at least temporarily sever every illegal drug distribution chain in America. Now, it probably wouldn't take very long to rebuild some of those, and it would take longer to rebuild more of those, and eventually we would still have this illegal drug distribution chain in America because the problem we have is that the demand for illegal drugs in this country is so powerful and so great, somebody is going to find a way to meet that demand.

Until this Nation understands that we have to line up against the consumption of illegal drugs and shut down that magnet that brings illegal drugs into America, we are going to have billions of dollars come out of our economy that are going to flow to and through Mexico to other points where drugs are originated. We have \$60 billion a year that are wired out of the United States to points south; about half of that to Mexico, and the other half goes to the Caribbean, Central America, and South America. About \$30 billion into Mexico, about \$30 billion to points south.

Some would argue that those are legitimate wages that are being wired back to family and loved ones. Yes, I would agree some of that is legitimate wages that are being wired back to family and loved ones in those countries of origin of people who are working here in the United States. A lot of it is illegal wages that is going south that should not have been earned in the first place if we had enforced our immigration law.

But a whole lot is being wired, shipped, laundered out of the United States to pay for the drug buys going south in places like Mexico and on down through Central America to South America. And we don't have a Drug Enforcement Agency that understands this equation adequately enough to intercept them. I have

talked to them. I don't blame them entirely for that. We need a mission at the top.

The President of the United States has got to articulate a mission. Instead, he is playing race bait games to undermine the law enforcement in the State of Arizona and across the country, and undermining the efforts of our Border Patrol, ICE, and customs border protection. And, by the way, the Shadow Wolves down there, the cells whom I admire so much and have a good friendship with, they are out there doing their job every day.

The Attorney General isn't willing, cannot, and I asked the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee to point out for me what I am missing in the Constitution that would prohibit Arizona from passing an immigration law like they did, or what is in the Federal code that would prohibit them from doing so, or what is in case law that might apply to that. And, of course, Mr. SMITH, an excellent lawyer with a wonderful staff in his own right, doesn't fill out the answers to the those questions because I don't believe there are any. And I don't believe the Attorney General fills out the answers to those questions because I don't believe there are any.

When I raised the issue that the office of the Department of Justice is playing, is politically motivated, of course he rebuts that. He has to give the "I am pure" and "we don't do political things within my department." Well, I will raise some points that I believe are definitive rebuttals to that.

I believe that the Justice Department has demonstrated a political nature well beyond immigration, and I would take us to the case of the most open-and-shut voter intimidation case in the history of the United States of America, and that was in Philadelphia in a previous election where we have video of members of the New Black Panthers standing outside of a polling place in paramilitary uniforms and berets, and one of them is standing there with a billy club, a nightstick, smacking it into his hand and calling people, white people coming in to vote, calling them "crackers" and telling them that they are going to take over the country and he is going to be out of power, those white people. It was intimidating to the individual that collected that film.

There is much other investigation which has gone on, and this investigation that was carried on by the Justice Department before President Obama swore into office and before Eric Holder became the Attorney General, there was an open-and-shut case that was completed against the Black Panthers that were intimidating voters. And I don't believe I need to say at this point "allegedly," because I have seen the film. It is the most open-and-shut case.

But, when Eric Holder took office shortly after that, we saw the most open-and-shut case in the history of America of voter intimidation can-

celled by the Justice Department. The case was there. They had everything but a plea, and perhaps they had a plea and I didn't verify that.

Now, the New Black Panther Party, there were two lawyers involved in the dismissal of this who have a bit of a reputation: Steve Rosenbaum and Loretta King. According to an article written in the National Review by Hans von Spakovsky, who has a personal knowledge of most of the lawyers involved in Justice on these issues, that Rosenbaum and King are two of the worst political hacks to be found in the career ranks of the civil rights division. That is an exact quote out of his article. He goes on and says: I have previously written about King's ambition to run for office in Maryland and on the Democratic ticket.

But putting that aside, Rosenbaum hasn't worked on a voting case since he left the voting section in 1994; yet he came in in 2009 to cancel the most open-and-shut voter intimidation case in the history of the United States. That is the New Black Panther Party members standing in paramilitary uniforms and berets, billy club in hand, calling white voters coming in "crackers" and intimidating them, and at least implicitly threatening them. And they cancelled the investigation when we have video of the most open-and-shut voter intimidation case in the history of America.

And then von Spakovsky goes on in his article to say that Loretta King hasn't worked on a voting case since she left the voting section in 1996. Yet the assistant attorney general on that case was Thomas Perez, who testified before the Judiciary Committee, and I believe he did so dishonestly, not just deceptively, when he told us they had achieved the highest punishment allowable under law. That was not true. That was not true. They accepted simply an injunction to prohibit one of those four members of the New Black Panther Party from doing the same thing again in the next election at the same location. That's the highest penalty allowed by law for intimidating voters in America? When the very underpinnings for our Constitution are legitimate elections, and even as important as legitimate elections it is the American people having faith in the legitimacy of our elections, canceled the case.

And he said that according to Tom Perez, the assistant attorney general, who should have to answer for some of this, he had two attorneys who had deep experience and he relied on their professional experience, their 60 years. Well, their 60 years didn't have to do with civil rights cases in the voter rights case, at least since 1994 or 1996.

And there were others that were involved in this that actually did the investigation that had substantial experience. In fact, they have more than 75 years between the two of them, the investigators that were involved in the actual investigation of that suit.

And by the way, Tom Perez, the assistant attorney general, in his testimony twice claimed that rule 11 mandated that the case be dismissed. Rule 11 provides sanction against lawyers who file frivolous and unwarranted lawsuits.

So our Department of Justice investigators, our attorneys trained specifically in that, who are bringing a lawsuit against voter intimidation for the New Black Panthers Party, when we have them on videotape, were intimidated because they thought there would be a rule 11 brought against them and there would be damages that would have to be paid because their investigation was frivolous? Frivolous or unwarranted, to be specific with the language. But to any lawyer, that is incendiary, to allege that a charge, a case that is being investigated professionally and legitimately might have a rule 11 brought against it and they had to drop it. It is an insult to the professionalism of our investigating attorneys whose names in this article are Coates and Adams. And they have prohibited them from defending themselves against such a charge, that they might have pursued a meritless case. And the Attorney General, in this case Perez, the assistant attorney general, operating under the authority of Eric Holder, has even ordered these attorneys not to comply with subpoenas before the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights when the law directs that they do so, the Federal law, and directs all these Federal agencies to "cooperate fully with the commission."

And the Justice Department isn't political? When they can cancel the most open-and-shut voter intimidation case in the history of the United States of America, I submit that is starkly and bitterly political and the direction that was given by Loretta King would not cause me so much to focus on her if I didn't see her name pop up elsewhere.

Well, it turns out that Loretta King, long time supposedly not a political appointment of the Department of Justice, has been involved in some other cases, cases in which attorney's fees were awarded against the Justice Department, and that would be rule 11. In the civil rights division of the Justice Department for filing a meritless case, Loretta King, whom Perez claims made the dismissal decision, and I accept that description because her name pops up enough other place so I believe that is true, was one of the lawyers on record in the case of *Johnson v. Miller*, which was a redistricting case that went all of the way to the Supreme Court.

And not only did Loretta King lose that case, but both the Supreme Court and the Federal district court severely criticized the civil rights division's handling of the case. They found its practices "disturbing." The district court found "considerable influence of the ACLU's advocacy on the voting rights decisions of the United States Attorney General to be an embarrassment."

So to read this in its continuity for the benefit of your attention, "The Supreme Court and the Federal district court severely criticized the civil rights division's handling of the case, finding its practices disturbing. The district court found the considerable influence of the ACLU's advocacy on the voting rights decisions of the United States Attorney General to be an embarrassment. It was also surprising that the Department of Justice was so blind to this impropriety, especially in a role as sensitive as that of preserving the fundamental right to vote."

This is what is going on with the case that Loretta King worked on that was rejected by both the district court and the Supreme Court. It went all of the way to the Supreme Court. The American taxpayers were forced to pay \$587,000 in attorneys' fees and costs that were awarded to the defendants to compensate them for an unwarranted lawsuit, one in which Loretta King and the other Justice Department lawyers commanded the State of Georgia, as the Supreme Court noted, to engage in "presumptively unconstitutional race-based districting." That's what we are working with.

So it looks like the antithesis of the allegation made by the assistant attorney general. It looks like Loretta King has been involved in some cases that had to do with race-based quota direction and distorting I think equal protection under the law. And this isn't the only case for Loretta King. I have named two now. She is a principal player in the dismissal of the most open-and-shut voter intimidation case in the history of America in Philadelphia, the New Black Panthers Party.

□ 1615

She's an attorney in the case that has been reversed by the United States Supreme Court resulting in \$587,000 in settlement costs because of the unjust case that was brought before the Court.

And now I move, Madam Speaker, to the third component of this, and this is Kinston, North Carolina. In Kinston, North Carolina, they had a referendum. They had a vote to decide to take their local elections and move them away from partisanship, to make them nonpartisan, so that the candidates that would be on the ballot for mayor and city council and whatever offices they may have in that city of Kinston, North Carolina, would not be labeled as Republicans or Democrats. They would be labeled instead as candidates to serve their community.

Well, it happens, that's the case in most of the city government in the United States. They are nonpartisan. People want to elect a mayor that's not a Democrat or a Republican, a mayor that's going to serve them in their community. They want to elect city council members of the same thing. They don't want them identified as Republicans or Democrats, and I'm glad that it is that way, as nonpartisan

as possible in local government. And whenever local government passes a referendum to make their elections and their office holders nonpartisan, we should champion that. We should be working against partisanship.

But the opposite happened in the case of the decision of the Department of Justice. Now, you might ask yourself, Madam Speaker, why would the Department of Justice stick their nose in a local decision. Madam Speaker, you might ask yourself, had you been focusing on my dialogue here, why local governments would want to have a referendum, why they would want it to be nonpartisan. We know the answer. They want to get away from the bitter partisanship.

But furthermore, Madam Speaker, you might ask, why would the Justice Department inject themselves into a local political decision and deny Kinston, North Carolina's decision made by a significant majority of their people that they wanted their people elected, not as Republicans or Democrats, but just simply as nonpartisan servants of their community.

Well, it happens that Kinston, North Carolina, is one of those covered districts that are defined under some of the Voting Rights Act that was authorized, reauthorized here some three or more years ago in the United States Congress. These covered districts cannot change anything within their election law or practices without being approved by the Justice Department, the civil rights division of the Justice Department. And so if you're in a covered district—now, covered districts are generally those districts that would have had a high percentage of minorities in them, presumably, also that have a history of, let's say, the institutionalization of Jim Crow laws or racism that goes back to the civil rights era of the 50s and 60s. When the Civil Rights Act was passed in, I'm guessing now, I believe it was 1964 or 1965, these covered districts were restricted from making changes in their election practices without approval of the Justice Department, in fact the civil rights division of the Justice Department.

So in Kinston, North Carolina, or many other places across the country, if they had a voting booth that was in an old city hall building and the city hall was falling down, and they wanted to move that voting booth across the street into the new city hall building, they would have to get the approval of the Justice Department to move that voting booth over there, and the Justice Department would then be doing an evaluation as to whether that voting booth was being moved for some race reason.

That's the minutiae of what's going on. It's a bigger picture, and there are other ways to analyze it. But I'll boil it down to the minutiae because this is minutiae, Madam Speaker. This Kinston, North Carolina argument is minutiae. They decided they wanted to have nonpartisan elections. I couldn't

imagine why that would be race based or have anything to do with race.

Well, they were denied, and the will of the people in Kinston, North Carolina, was wiped out and negated by a decision that was written by Loretta King, who said, and when the case referred to a change to nonpartisan elections, and I have the letter that goes to the city and it says this—now, imagine, this thinking. It is beyond my ability to get my mind around this. It says: Removing the partisan cue in municipal elections will, in all likelihood, eliminate the single factor that allows black candidates to be elected to office.

Now, how could anyone get to this point where, if your motive is for black candidates to be elected to office, you have to identify them apparently as Democrats, or otherwise people going to the polls wouldn't know how to vote for the black candidate if they didn't have a D by their name. This is, if there's a rationale in Loretta King's writing, that's it. And it's pretty much a stretch, in my view. But she writes this, and I'll repeat this into the RECORD, Madam Speaker, because this is breathtaking: removing the partisan cue in municipal elections, meaning identifying as either Democrat or Republican, the D or the R, in all likelihood, would eliminate the single factor. Eliminate. Now it didn't say one of the factors or a primary factor. It said it would eliminate the single factor that allows black candidates to be elected to office.

In other words, she's saying if you don't have a D by your name and you're a black candidate, you can't be elected to office. It's the single factor, according to her interpretation. So she wiped out the will of the people of Kinston, North Carolina, with this Justice Department decision under the hand of Loretta King.

And she goes on and writes: In Kinston elections voters base their choice more on the race of a candidate rather than on his or her political affiliation.

Wow. Do I read that that she's defining the people in Kinston, North Carolina, as racists at their core? They base their choice more on the race of the candidate than on their political affiliation.

And she goes on to write: Without either the appeal to party loyalty or the ability to vote a straight ticket, the limited remaining support from white voters for a black candidate will diminish even more. And given that the city's electorate is overwhelmingly Democratic, while the motivating factor for this change may be partisan, the effect will be strictly racial.

Oh, my gracious. These kind of decisions, the decision that wipes out the will of the people of Kinston, North Carolina, identifies them as a bunch of racists that can't decide who they want to be their mayor, without having a label of an R or a D beside them because that's an indicator of race. A D is an indicator that you're more likely a



minority candidate apparently, according to her analysis. There's nothing here that's based on anything that has to do with law, except that it tears asunder the equal protection clause of the Constitution that makes it a race-based decision on her part, that sets up and accuses people of being racist.

And by the way, the Voting Rights Act and the covered district component of this label somebody's granddaughter who was born a generation and a half or two after her grandfather was labeled a racist by this law, also a racist. It makes it, you inherit racism under this covered district Voting Rights Act.

But I suggest Attorney General Holder, if he's going to be a nonpoliticized Justice Department, has an obligation to take a look at all of the actions of Loretta King. If she can go in and wipe out the will of the people of Kinston, North Carolina, define them all as a group of, well, a significant majority of them anyway, as a group of racists, if she can cancel the most open-and-shut voter intimidation case in the history of the United States of America, if she can bring a case that's so unmerited that it ends up costing the taxpayers \$587,000 under rule 11, and if the Justice Department, under the direction of Eric Holder and under the decision and under-the-oath testimony of Assistant Attorney General Tom Perez, if the Justice Department can do the things that they have done and argue that they had to close the Black Panthers voter intimidation case because of the fear of rule 11 when, in fact, it's the other way around, and the Attorney General of the United States would sit before the Judiciary Committee an hour and a half or so ago and tell this Nation that his office isn't politicized, with all of this evidence to the contrary, and put all of the resources that he has into the investigation of Arizona immigration law, the constitutionality of it, whether there's a Federal statute that prohibits it or whether there's any case law out there, any case precedents that might affect it, and still not speak to any of those three issues, so the resources of the United States of America are being used in a politicized fashion, Madam Speaker, and I think I have made my case. I appreciate your attention.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RANGEL (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 12 p.m. on account of business in the district.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. SUTTON) to revise and ex-

tend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. SUTTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KOSMAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. NEUGEBAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, May 18, 19, and 20.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, May 20.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, May 20.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, May 18, 19, and 20.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 14, 2010, at 11:30 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7460. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Final Free and Reserve Percentages for 2009-10 Crop Natural (Sun-Dried) Seedless Raisins [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0075 and FV10-989-1 IFR] received May 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7461. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-B-1116] received April 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7462. A letter from the Managing Associate General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting a report on the major rule from the Environmental Protection Agency entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7463. A letter from the Assistant Director for Policy, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Somalia Sanctions Regulations received April 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7464. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-400, "OTO Hotel at Constitution Square Economic Development Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7465. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-397, "Bonus and Special Pay Clarification Temporary Amend-

ment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7466. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-395, "Neighborhood Supermarket Tax Relief Clarification Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7467. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-396 "Anti-Graffiti Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7468. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-394, "Department of Parks and Recreation Capital Construction Mentorship Program Temporary Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7469. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-383, "Uniform Emergency Volunteer Health Practitioners Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7470. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Collection of Administrative Debts; Collection of Debts Arising from Enforcement and Administration of Campaign Finance Laws [Notice 2010-10] received April 14, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.

7471. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting annual report on the Indian Health Service Funding for contract support Costs of self-determination awards for Fiscal Year 2008, pursuant to Public Law 93-638, section 106(c); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7472. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting Amendments To The Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2074; (H. Doc. No. 111—110); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

7473. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072; (H. Doc. No. 111—111); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

7474. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2074; (H. Doc. No. 111—112); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

7475. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Evidence that have been adopted by the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072; (H. Doc. No. 111—113); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

7476. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendment to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2075; (H. Doc. No. 111—114); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

7477. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the report on the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act covering the six months ending June 30, 2009, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 621; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7478. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the semi-annual report of the Attorney

General concerning enforcement actions taken by the Department under the Lobbying Disclosure Act, Public Law 104-65, as amended by Public Law 110-81, codified at 2 U.S.C. Sec. 1605(b)(1) for the semi-annual period beginning on January 1, 2009; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7479. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-200, A330-300, and A340-300 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1108; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-131-AD; Amendment 39-16260; AD 2010-08-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7480. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model 340-500 and -600 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0282; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-140-AD; Amendment 39-16262; AD 2010-08-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7481. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Oxnard, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1009; Airspace Docket No. 09-AWP-11] received April 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7482. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; North Bend, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0831; Airspace Docket No. 09-ANM-13] received April 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7483. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Low Altitude Area Navigation Route T-254; Houston, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0015; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASW-18] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7484. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Rifle, CO [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1014; Airspace Docket No. 09-ANM-10] received April 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7485. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Altus, OK [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0405; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASW-17] received April 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7486. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Hollywood, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0300; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASO-17] received April 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7487. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting the final integrated General Reevaluation Report and Environmental Impact Statement for West Onslow Beach and New River Inlet, North Carolina; (H. Doc. No. 111—109); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

7488. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1876-DR for the State of Oklahoma; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Appropriations, and Homeland Security.

7489. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1877-DR for the State of Iowa; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Appropriations, and Homeland Security.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. REHBERG (for himself and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN):

H.R. 5294. A bill to prevent Federal agencies from regulating greenhouse gas emissions for purposes of addressing climate change without express and specific statutory authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 5295. A bill to ensure that patients receive accurate health care information by prohibiting misleading and deceptive advertising or representation in the provision of health care services, and to require the identification of the license of health care professionals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. CARDOZA):

H.R. 5296. A bill to address the health and economic development impacts of nonattainment of federally mandated air quality standards in the San Joaquin Valley, California, by designating air quality empowerment zones; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. WATT, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. BEAN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MAFFEI, and Mrs. DAHLKEMPER):

H.R. 5297. A bill to create the Small Business Lending Fund Program to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make capital investments in eligible institutions in order to increase the availability of credit for small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TIAHRT (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. JENKINS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BACA, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. HARE):

H.R. 5298. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to take illegal subsidization into ac-

count in evaluating proposals for contracts for major defense acquisition programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PENCE (for himself, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HENSARLING, and Ms. GRANGER):

H.R. 5299. A bill to temporarily prohibit United States loans to the International Monetary Fund to be used to provide financing for any member state of the European Union; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H.R. 5300. A bill to provide safeguards with respect to the Federal Bureau of Investigation criminal background checks prepared for employment purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. MICA, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. JONES, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 5301. A bill to extend the period during which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and States are prohibited from requiring a permit under section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for certain discharges that are incidental to normal operation of vessels; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. REYES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WATT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. BEAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina):

H.R. 5302. A bill to establish the State Small Business Credit Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 5303. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve housing stipends for veterans receiving educational assistance under the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 5304. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for improvements under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program to reduce racial and ethnic disparities in the criminal justice system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. HARPER):

H.R. 5305. A bill to mandate the monthly formulation and publication of a consumer price index specifically for senior citizens to establish an accurate Social Security COLA for such citizens; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. EMERSON:

H.R. 5306. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require employers to sign a statement on their income tax returns that they do not knowingly employ individuals in the United States who are not authorized to be employed in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. GIFFORDS (for herself and Mr. HELLER):

H.R. 5307. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to include ultralight aircraft under the definition of aircraft for purposes of the aviation smuggling provisions under that Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. TOWNS, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 5308. A bill to provide for the posthumous promotion of Charles Young to the grade of brigadier general in the United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. OLVER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. FARR, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FILNER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 5309. A bill to establish certain duties for pharmacies to ensure provision of Food and Drug Administration-approved contraception, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. SESTAK):

H.R. 5310. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to reauthorize and improve the Brownfields revitalization program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. KANJORSKI):

H.R. 5311. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the treatment of municipal bonds guaranteed by Federal home loan banks as tax exempt bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHAUER (for himself, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. JONES, Mr. HARE, Ms. SUTTON, and Ms. SHEAPORTER):

H.R. 5312. A bill to limit the total value of Chinese goods that may be procured by the United States Government during a calendar year to not more than the total value of United States goods procured by the Chinese Government if any during the preceding calendar year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself and Mr. PUTNAM):

H.R. 5313. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to require offshore oil rigs to install acoustic control systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. MARCHANT):

H.R. 5314. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 15-year recov-

ery period for nonresidential real property in rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 5315. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the period of time in which a member of the Armed Forces may transfer educational assistance under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program to a dependent child; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5316. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to establish an office in Anchorage, Alaska, under the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5317. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property from the United States to the Maniilaq Association located in Kotzebue, Alaska; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.J. Res. 84. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving Congress power to regulate campaign contributions for Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HALVORSON (for herself and Mr. FILNER):

H. Con. Res. 278. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a grateful Nation supports and salutes Sons and Daughters in Touch on its 20th Anniversary that is being held on Father's Day, 2010, at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FARR (for himself, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. McNERNEY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STARK, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. DREIER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. CHU, Ms. WATSON, Ms. WATERS, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BACA, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. FILNER, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H. Res. 1358. A resolution recognizing the contribution made by the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies to combat the spread of weapons of mass destruction by training the next generation of nonproliferation specialists and disseminating timely information and analysis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ACKERMAN (for himself and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H. Res. 1359. A resolution calling for the immediate and unconditional release of Israeli soldier Gilad Shalit held captive by Hamas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KRATOVIL:

H. Res. 1360. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to guarantee reasonable time prior to the consideration of legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. McHENRY, Mr. COBLE,

Ms. FUDGE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SHULER, and Mr. WATT):  
H. Res. 1361. A resolution recognizing North Carolina Central University on its 100th anniversary; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

279. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 44 urging the Congress to implement suggestions in the Resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 126: Mr. DUNCAN.  
H.R. 207: Mr. HODES.  
H.R. 208: Mr. PITTS, Mr. LoBIONDO, and Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 413: Mr. INSLEE and Mr. CARNEY.  
H.R. 886: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
H.R. 1021: Mr. COHEN and Mr. STEARNS.  
H.R. 1093: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 1175: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
H.R. 1179: Mr. TERRY.  
H.R. 1189: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.  
H.R. 1205: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.  
H.R. 1410: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Ms. KILROY.  
H.R. 1547: Mr. INGLIS, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. CALVERT.  
H.R. 1625: Mr. BRIGHT and Ms. HARMAN.  
H.R. 1643: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. BOUCHER.  
H.R. 1744: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. SPRATT.  
H.R. 1826: Mr. DEUTCH.  
H.R. 1864: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.  
H.R. 1866: Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 1874: Mr. HINCHEY.  
H.R. 2067: Mr. PALLONE.  
H.R. 2103: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
H.R. 2149: Ms. MATSUI.  
H.R. 2222: Mr. PASCRELL.  
H.R. 2267: Mr. MURPHY of New York.  
H.R. 2363: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Ms. RICHARDSON.  
H.R. 2378: Mr. ELLSWORTH and Mr. CALVERT.  
H.R. 2381: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.  
H.R. 2480: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.  
H.R. 2483: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
H.R. 2485: Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 2546: Mr. RADANOVICH.  
H.R. 2553: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.  
H.R. 2555: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Ms. RICHARDSON.  
H.R. 2561: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.  
H.R. 2601: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. BOUCHER.  
H.R. 2736: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.  
H.R. 2746: Mr. POLIS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LoBIONDO, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.  
H.R. 2872: Mr. HOLT.  
H.R. 2897: Mr. HEINRICH.  
H.R. 3035: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. ELLSWORTH.  
H.R. 3077: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
H.R. 3181: Ms. CLARKE.  
H.R. 3257: Mr. SABLAN.  
H.R. 3287: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 3379: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H.R. 3668: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. REYES, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. TURNER, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. WHITFIELD.  
H.R. 3675: Mr. HOLT.  
H.R. 3712: Mr. GRAYSON.  
H.R. 3724: Mr. DELAHUNT.  
H.R. 3734: Mr. McDERMOTT.  
H.R. 3781: Mr. REHBERG.  
H.R. 3790: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. WALDEN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. FILNER.  
H.R. 3995: Ms. HIRONO.  
H.R. 4055: Mr. PIERLUISI.  
H.R. 4068: Mr. AKIN.  
H.R. 4080: Mr. PIERLUISI.  
H.R. 4115: Ms. SUTTON and Mr. GRAYSON.  
H.R. 4142: Mr. SHERMAN.  
H.R. 4148: Mr. BISHOP of New York.  
H.R. 4191: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H.R. 4278: Mr. STUPAK.  
H.R. 4383: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 4393: Mr. CALVERT.  
H.R. 4403: Mr. SABLAN.  
H.R. 4427: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.  
H.R. 4533: Mr. ISRAEL.  
H.R. 4553: Mr. CARNEY.  
H.R. 4554: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.  
H.R. 4671: Mr. EHLERS and Mr. HILL.  
H.R. 4710: Mr. WU.  
H.R. 4713: Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 4728: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. CALVERT.  
H.R. 4733: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.  
H.R. 4737: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.  
H.R. 4803: Mr. TERRY and Mr. SULLIVAN.  
H.R. 4819: Mr. CONYERS.  
H.R. 4830: Mr. STARK.  
H.R. 4844: Mr. PETERSON.  
H.R. 4868: Mr. WEINER.  
H.R. 4871: Ms. BEAN.  
H.R. 4879: Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. HALL of New York.  
H.R. 4883: Mr. LATTA.  
H.R. 4888: Ms. BALDWIN.  
H.R. 4889: Mr. BURGESS.  
H.R. 4910: Mr. CALVERT.  
H.R. 4914: Mr. GRAYSON.  
H.R. 4923: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. COHEN.  
H.R. 4933: Mr. RUSH and Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 4951: Mr. BOOZMAN and Mr. MARCHANT.  
H.R. 4952: Mr. REICHERT.  
H.R. 4959: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.  
H.R. 5015: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. LOEBSACK.  
H.R. 5016: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. ISSA, Mr. PITTS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. LATTA, Mr. OLSON, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. SHAD-EGG, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HELLER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. HERGER.  
H.R. 5029: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.  
H.R. 5035: Mr. HOLDEN.  
H.R. 5038: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.  
H.R. 5044: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. STARK.  
H.R. 5049: Mr. SABLAN.  
H.R. 5054: Mr. FLEMING.  
H.R. 5092: Mr. BUYER, Ms. GIFFORDS, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 5111: Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. BONNER.  
H.R. 5117: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. ESHOO.  
H.R. 5118: Mr. SULLIVAN.  
H.R. 5120: Mr. FILNER, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Mr. GRAYSON.  
H.R. 5122: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.  
H.R. 5142: Ms. BEAN.  
H.R. 5174: Mr. DENT and Mr. PASCARELL.  
H.R. 5175: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. INSLEE.  
H.R. 5177: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. COURTNEY.  
H.R. 5191: Mr. PAYNE.  
H.R. 5198: Mr. SABLAN.  
H.R. 5211: Mr. TONKO.  
H.R. 5213: Ms. SPEIER and Ms. WATERS.  
H.R. 5214: Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H.R. 5222: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H.R. 5225: Mr. WALZ.  
H.R. 5226: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. BOCCIERI.  
H.R. 5234: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.  
H.R. 5257: Mr. TERRY.  
H.R. 5268: Mr. FARR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.  
H.R. 5279: Mr. PASCARELL.  
H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. CALVERT.  
H. Con. Res. 245: Mr. PLATTS.  
H. Con. Res. 265: Mr. PENCE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.  
H. Con. Res. 266: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. MCCOTTER.  
H. Con. Res. 271: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. BOOZMAN.  
H. Con. Res. 274: Mr. TURNER and Mr. FLEMING.  
H. Res. 173: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.  
H. Res. 263: Mr. WOLF.  
H. Res. 407: Mr. SNYDER and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.  
H. Res. 510: Mr. LATOURETTE.  
H. Res. 584: Mr. CALVERT.  
H. Res. 762: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. MAFFEI.  
H. Res. 913: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
H. Res. 996: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.  
H. Res. 1026: Mr. CALVERT.  
H. Res. 1052: Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.  
H. Res. 1056: Mr. CALVERT.  
H. Res. 1073: Mr. BUYER and Mr. CALVERT.  
H. Res. 1110: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. TURNER.  
H. Res. 1122: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. TERRY.  
H. Res. 1152: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WATSON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. HARE, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. WATERS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. WATT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. RANGEL.  
H. Res. 1169: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BOYD, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. PUTNAM,

Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CHU, Mr. HIMES, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HODES, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. MATHE-SON.

H. Res. 1175: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. CALVERT.  
H. Res. 1207: Mr. LINDER and Mr. DICKS.  
H. Res. 1219: Mr. LEWIS of California and Mr. GALLEGLY.  
H. Res. 1264: Mr. PASCARELL.  
H. Res. 1273: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. BOREN.  
H. Res. 1275: Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. SIREs, and Mr. GARAMENDI.  
H. Res. 1290: Mr. REYES and Mr. KIRK.  
H. Res. 1291: Ms. NORTON.  
H. Res. 1292: Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FORBES, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. DENT, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. REICHERT.  
H. Res. 1302: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.  
H. Res. 1313: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. LINDER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. BONNER.  
H. Res. 1319: Mr. TONKO.  
H. Res. 1321: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.  
H. Res. 1330: Mr. COHEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.  
H. Res. 1346: Mr. WITTMAN.  
H. Res. 1350: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BACA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. FARR, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. CHU, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. SIREs, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. RAHALL.  
H. Res. 1352: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. ROSS, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
H. Res. 1357: Mr. WAXMAN and Ms. RICHARDSON.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.J. Res. 76: Mr. KILDEE.